REPORT RESUMES

ED 016 713 UD 004 600

NATIONAL CONFERENCE ON EDUCATION OF THE DISADVANTAGED, REPORT OF A NATIONAL CONFERENCE (WASHINGTON, D.C., JULY 18-20, 1966).

BY- ASBELL, BERNARD, ED.

OFFICE OF EDUCATION (DHEW), WASHINGTON, D.C.

REPORT NUMBER OE-37004 PUB DATE 66

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.50 HC-$3.40 83P.

DESCRIPTORS- *CONFERENCE REPORTS, *DISADVANTAGED YOUTH, *COMPENSATORY EDUCATION PROGRAMS, THEATER ARTS, SCHOOL INTEGRATION, SCHOOL RESPONSIBILITY, TEACHER AIDES, CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT, COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT, FAMILY INVOLVEMENT, EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH, INSERVICE TEACHER EDUCATION, ESEA TITLE 1

THIS REPORT OF A NATIONAL PLANNING CONFERENCE ON EDUCATION FOR DISADVANTAGED YOUTH CONTAINS SUMMARIES OF THE CONFERENCE'S PANEL DISCUSSIONS AND TEXTS OF SEVERAL ADDRESSES. THE PANELS CONCENTRATED ON THE NATURE OF THE 1965 ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION ACT (ESEA) TITLE I PROGRAMS, THE EXTENT OF THE SCHOOL'S RESPONSIBILITY TO ELIMINATE EDUCATIONAL AND SOCIAL DISADVANTAGEMENT, TEACHER TRAINING AND TEACHER AIDES, APPROACHES TO CURRICULUM AND LEARNING, PARENTAL AND COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT, AND RESEARCH AND EVALUATION. ESEA TITLE I PROGRAMS FOR MUSIC, THEATER, AND DANCE AND THE RELATIONSHIP OF TITLE I TO SCHOOL DESEGREGATION WERE ALSO CONCERNS OF THE CONFERENCE. SPEECHES WERE DELIVERED BY THE PRESIDENT AND VICE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES, THE UNITED STATES COMMISSIONER OF EDUCATION, AND THE DIRECTOR OF THE CENTER FOR ADVANCED STUDY IN THE BEHAVIORAL SCIENCES. THIS DOCUMENT IS AVAILABLE AS CATALOG NO. FS-5.237--37004 FROM THE SUPERINTENDENT OF DOCUMENTS, U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE, WASHINGTON, D.C. 20402, FOR $0.55. (LB)

Title I, Elementary and Secondary
Education Act of 1965

OE-37004

ED016713

04600

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

National Conference on Education of the Disadvantaged

Report of a National Conference
Held in Washington, D.C.,
July 18–20, 1966

UD 004600

U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare
John W. Gardner, *Secretary*

Office of Education
Harold Howe II, *Commissioner*

The White House

Statement by the President

I have asked the U.S. Commissioner of Education, Harold Howe II, to call a national planning conference in Washington, July 18–20, on education for disadvantaged children.

The program provided by Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 has been started and the funds for this fiscal year dispersed in an unusually brief span of time. Its value has been clearly demonstrated. There are 7 million children who are receiving a better education this year because our State and local school systems moved swiftly and with ingenuity to use these funds. We must now assure ourselves that progress is universal. The gains made in some schools can be duplicated throughout the Nation if we exchange information and ideas quickly.

To this end I have suggested to Commissioner Howe that he invite the chief education officer of each State to name a four-man delegation to the conference. This delegation would be comprised of the State's Title I coordinator, a representative from a State college or university, and a representative each from an urban and a rural area.

The conference will provide a working environment for exchanging ideas and exploring new methods of educating the children of poverty. It can concern itself with problems discussed in the report of the National Advisory Council on Education of the Disadvantaged.

I have asked Commissioner Howe to make the results of the conference known to all State educational agencies, and I hope this meeting will be the forerunner of a series of similar conferences in each State before the fall school opening. We cannot rest until every boy and girl who needs special help in school receives it in the most effective, imaginative form that American ingenuity can devise.

MAY 24, 1966.

FOREWORD

This report on the National Conference on Education of the Disadvantaged testifies to the spirit of honest inquiry which motivated the conference participants. It is, in fact, a striking tribute to the candor and integrity of American educators, engaged in a search for lasting solutions to the educational problems of our time.

If the report appears to focus on shortcomings in our schools, this is because our educators recognize that self-examination, rather than self-congratulation, provides the key to progress. I think it is clear, however, that throughout the Nation, American teachers are gaining new insights into the educational process and are seeking, and finding, ways to make all our children more successful in the schools.

The spirit of change and progress which marks our schools today has been greatly stimulated by Federal programs established under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965. It is my hope and belief that this conference, and the printed summary of its proceedings, will be a provocative and refreshing stimulus to further progress.

I extend my heartfelt thanks and congratulations to the conference participants for their enthusiasm, their perceptiveness, and their productive deliberations.

It would be impossible for me in this short space to name all the others who gave so generously of their time, talent, and energies to this large undertaking. I can only say that I am most grateful to all persons, both within and outside the U.S. Office of Education, who contributed to the success of the conference.

Harold Howe II

HAROLD HOWE II,
U.S. Commissioner of Education

JULY 28, 1966.

CONTENTS

Page

FOREWORD V

INTRODUCTION 1

Section I. SUMMARY OF PANEL DISCUSSIONS 3

- Using Title I To Produce Change 5
- The School Views the Child—and Vice Versa 10
- How Much Can Schools Really Do? 14
- Training and Reorientation of Teachers. 18
- Getting Help for Teachers 22
- What Approaches to Curriculum and Learning? 24
- Involving Parents and the Community 29
- Research and Evaluation 33

Section II. SPECIAL PROGRAMS 35

- Title I and School Desegregation 37
- Title I and the Performing Arts: Some Possible Approaches 47

Section III. MAJOR ADDRESSES 53

- Opening General Session
  - The Vice President of the United States 55
  - Dr. Ralph W. Tyler 60
- Second General Session
  - The President of the United States 65
  - The U.S. Commissioner of Education 66

Section IV. COMMENTS BY PANELISTS

APPENDIXES 81

- A: Program Outline 83
- B: Discussion Panels 84

INTRODUCTION

As any multimillionaire will testify, "Making the first million is the hardest." As any educator concerned with Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act will readily paraphrase it, "Spending the first billion is the hardest."

The National Conference on Education of the Disadvantaged convened less than 365 days after America made its first Federal commitment—in cash—to start wiping out inequality of opportunity in the schools.

More than 400 educators, as well as professional allies and critics, gathered at the Mayflower Hotel in Washington. Among them were the Title I coordinators from each of the States, a hardy group that stands in the eye of a national hurricane, weathering conflicting demands and expectations, yet upon which the Nation depends to pilot it over an uncharted sea.

Although Title I is regarded as an *action* program, it is, like early phases of the space program, a huge undertaking in *research* of the totally unknown. Perhaps one day soon a conference on education of the disadvantaged will be characterized by a competitive exchange of success stories and answers. This year's conference, first in perhaps a long series, certainly was not. It was hardly even an exchange of questions. It was a *search* for questions. At this early stage, the main question that emerged was not, How do you proceed? but, Where do you begin? If everyone agreed—as almost everyone did—that change is imperative and urgent, almost no one was sure of where change should properly start. Must change begin with the teacher, the principal, the superintendent, the school board? Do you begin in the school lunchroom by insuring a good breakfast as fuel for a healthy mind? Do you begin with parents, teaching them to read stories to the young and to spur the ambitions of the nearly grown? Do you begin with community action, trying to restore the confidence of the alienated in a society that claims to guarantee health care, police protection, a right to free choice of good housing, and equal opportunity to work for a living? Or is the question purely one of improving the skills of pedagogy? Do you begin with the mind of the child?

About half of the conference was composed of educational professionals directly engaged in planning or administering title I projects. They numbered four from each State—usually the State Title I coordinator, a university education specialist, and two administrators or teachers directly engaged in a Title I project, one urban and one rural.

The remaining half of the conference consisted of outsiders—Government officials in education and related fields, community action specialists, civil rights leaders, and officials of major educational organizations.

At times the conference was divided, as though in debate, by a loosely definable line. Community action specialists and civil rights leaders pressed for dramatic change in the structure of schools. To them, the evidence clearly added up to a gross failure of the schools, and therefore gross change was mandatory. Some of the school people present understandably resisted this report card of blanket failure. If educational adjustments need to be made in keeping with new national expectations, they argued, experienced professionals are the most qualified to judge what adjustments are necessary and how to make them. The mammoth institution of public education, they said, cannot be uprooted overnight; old institutions are capable of producing new kinds of behavior for new needs.

When at times the words grew hot, the listening correspondingly grew more alert. It was not a debate which anyone won or lost. It was an interpenetration of ideas from diverse vantage points. It is safe to say that no conferee went home without a deeper understanding of the complexities in which he is engaged.

The spirit of the Conference was effectively keynoted by Vice President Hubert H. Humphrey in a stirring address at the opening night's banquet. He called upon the delegates to help close the gap between the real and the ideal in education—"an educational system that will train, rather than chain, the human mind; that will uplift, rather than depress, the human spirit; that will illuminate, rather than obscure, the path to wisdom; that will help *every* member of society to the full use of his natural talents."

At the second night banquet, delegates were honored with a surprise visit by the President of the United States, who emphasized the high priority of the work of the conference in the great range of national commitments.

A final word about the structure of this report: Conferees were assigned to discussion panels, each panel to consider one of four topics: I. Diagnosis of the Problem; II. Strategies for Action; III. Some Effective Approaches; IV. Mobilizing Our Resources. Each subject had not one, but two panels charged with discussing it. The thought was that, because one mix of human beings is unlike any other, two panels on any subject might produce two valuable sets of viewpoints and ideas. Each panel was enriched by six or seven guest panelists who presented short papers on experiences or theory with which they were identified. Each was served by consultants from the U.S. Office of Education or some other Government agency.

In addition, two special group discussions were arranged: *Title I and School Desegregation*, and *Title I and the Performing Arts.*

For a very good reason, section I of this report, which summarizes the eight panel discussions, does not follow a panel-by-panel narrative format. The enthusiasm of the conferees, the freedom of discussion, and the very interrelationship of all aspects of the subject matter caused the panels to exceed the confines of their titles and to touch on most aspects of educating the disadvantaged.

To provide a logical grouping of related discussions, therefore, section I is divided into eight topics of prominent concern. Panel reports have been broken up and distributed within these eight topic reports. Under each topic, material is arranged in a sequence suggested by the flow of information. It is believed that this format will enhance the report's usefulness both to the participants and to others seeking to discover the real spirit and substance of the discussions.

If the discussion recorded in the subsequent pages appears useful and lively, much of the credit is owed to the distinguished group of panel chairmen. And, rich as the discussion was, its usefulness to others would have been lost without the skilled labors of eight summary writers, each an experienced and professional craftsman, and of the conference's editorial director, Bernard Asbell, who collated and edited their work.

The chairmen, summary writers, panelists, and consultants are identified in the panel lists appended to this report.

Section I. SUMMARY OF PANEL DISCUSSIONS

Using Title I to Produce Change

Panel IVA

Participants agreed that the poor of America, despite the potential of programs such as Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (ESEA), still have little reason to believe they matter as human beings. The disadvantaged, adults and children, are failing in the educational system, and the educational system is failing them.

Participants agreed that there are many roadblocks to educational reform.

"If you're going to lead, you're going to have to cope with power," said panelist Mario D. Fantini, program associate, the Ford Foundation. "You need to be responsive to other sources of power and mobilize them. You have to be the internal agent of change. The educator needs power if he wants to lead, and he does not have power today."

Dr. Fantini, who directed Ford's 1962–65 Madison Area Project in Syracuse, New York, public schools, asserted that change can be effected through a "mutant group" which can "carve out a piece of the bureaucracy." While acknowledging that "we have no systematic internal system for change in the big bureaucracies," he said programs like Title I can be used to "create a subsystem for change."

He said that as a result of the Ford project, under which a much broader effort labeled "Crusade for Opportunity" has succeeded the original $160,000 program, "half of Syracuse, in 3 years, is radically different." Educators, he said, could expect similar results in their own communities if they used their Title I allocations as a catalyst for change. "At the end of 5 to 10 years," Fantini said, "we could have a different process for teaching children." He added: "I would like to see this money going into education serve as change money. We've built into our [educational] program a kind of remedial approach, a kind of strengthening what is. This is not going to be the payoff. I am hopeful that people here can begin to use the new money not for strengthening what is, but for changing what is."

Margaret G. Dabney, professor of adult education at Virginia State College, asked Dr. Fantini if the strategy he recommends would work "in different parts of the country where we are faced with total conservatism at all levels." He replied, "I look on every crisis situation as a chance for change. We should not just hang aid onto a system but we should use aid as an agent for change." He emphasized that he believes Title I people are the only group capable of setting in motion a large-scale program for producing a "steady search machinery" to change the schools.

Mrs. Dabney agreed that "we get hung up on a band-aid type of operation. We need to talk about a creative restructuring of the whole business."

Panel chairman John L. Cleveland, Title I coordinator for the Berkeley (California) Unified School District, concurred. "Whatever goals we have set for disadvantaged kids, they have not reached them," he said. "If I said there's a bomb under us right now, you'd make it, baby. . . . Educationally, we do have a bomb under us, under our whole educational system.

"The point is that we have no choice—whether we're going to lay the groundwork for change or sit around and be changed. We're failing. We don't have the answer. Eighty percent of these kids are going down the drain. . . . We've got to do the job quick or the whole system is going to blow up on us."

Panelist John J. O'Neill, dean of the Graduate School of Education at Rutgers University, said that "the question of the power structure is essential" in considering reform in the schools because "the schools always do what the culture wants." He said he was hopeful that colleges and universities can come up with some answers. "I think we have a staging area," he said, "but we don't have a beachhead and we don't have a perimeter."

What is lacking, participants agreed, is a full-scale commitment to the poor which would not only serve to improve their education and lives but would also instill in them a conviction of self-worth that should be their birthright. Mrs. Dabney reminded the group that "most of us could recite the psychological principles of poverty. So, why are we here? It's because these facts and principles and concepts really haven't worked their way into our guts."

Jule Sugarman, Deputy Director, Project Head Start, U.S. Office of Economic Opportunity (OEO), said much responsibility rests with the administrator. "It's been my experience that the most critical element is the guy at the top of the organization," he said. "A lot can be done by fiat. A lot can be done by incentive and encouragement, and recognition of effort.

"This says a lot for the process of getting leaders. If we're going to have any massive intervention into the problems of the poor, we've got to find ways to get good people into key spots in leadership roles. There is a tremendous premium on the character of the person who is leading. A program won't work unless the person at the top is receptive to it."

Chairman Cleveland added that Title I presents opportunities which have never before been available to the administrator and teacher on behalf of the children who heretofore have simply been problem children.

"A good thing about Title I," he said, "is that you don't have to succeed. You just have to try something new."

Panel IA

Panelist Philip Montez, State President, Association of Mexican-American Education, Los Angeles, Calif., told of an experiment with a group of alienated Hebrew and Mexican-American children in Los Angeles. Money was made available under Title I for the teachers to involve themselves at the community level. ". . . here I saw a teacher sitting with three or four kids drinking a coke, . . . talking their jazz, talking their lingual . . . This teacher in this program has been allowed time to participate with individual kids on things that are important to them, being willing to accept the threat of maybe entering into a world that she or he doesn't really understand. I think this is crucial in education today."

Another panelist, Arthur Pearl, Professor of Education, University of Oregon, said that the poor were "locked out" of our society and Title I could be used to change this situation. "The fact of the matter is right now, today, a Negro with a college education makes less money than a white person with a 10th grade education in this country," he said. "The unemployed rate with Negroes with less than high school education is just the same as if they had a high school education.

"Now, you have got $1 billion that can be used to start changing the world for people who are locked out. . . . The point is that out of . . . Title I you can hire poor people to teach. And you can start opening up the world for them."

Panel IIIA

One participant advised that Title I money be spent on the radical and revolutionary, "for the wilder the idea is, the more likely that it will do some good."

The participants were confused as to what innovation was supposed to mean and whether the ideas should be new per se or simply new to their school districts. Consultant Nolan Estes, Director, Division of Supplementary Plans and Services, Bureau of Elementary and Secondary Education, U.S. Office of Education (OE), outlined four essential steps for innovation: research or inquiry, development, diffusion, and utilization.

A question arose: Why concentrate on the innovative? Some contended that Title I presents an opportunity to get funds for old ideas that have not been tried in a school system previously because the money has never before been available. Such ideas, while old to the field, would be new to such a system.

Another contention was that innovative ideas usually require the kinds of specialized personnel that are hard to find and harder to train. In partial answer, it was suggested that, once Title I innovations are introduced, old parts of the curriculum that have not worked be eliminated, freeing the staff and equipment for the new programs. It was further advised that "our additive approach will run out. We need adaptive procedures because otherwise we'll run out of space, personnel, materials, and everything else."

The similarity of Title I projects was discussed, and some effort made to trace back their source. In at least one instance a publishing house has sent out a model proposal which, in turn, has been widely copied. The Federal guidelines and model proposals sent out by some of the States have been taken as gospel by some school systems and have been followed like blueprints. One reason for this is that, in the early stages of Title I, time was short and personnel to write proposals scarce. The participants expressed a desire for help in working up proposals and advice from coordinators and from college faculty in developing ideas.

This discussion got into the role of the Title I coordinator. Is the coordinator's function simply to see that the proposal is in order and pass it along for approval? Or is he to act as an innovator, encouraging superintendents and others to new ideas? There was no final agreement on the coordinator's role, although it was clear that some of the coordinators were functioning as program developers with local school systems.

A further, more basic question threaded its way through the meeting: Whether ideas that have failed in the past should be funded. An example was offered in the field of reading. Some 70 percent of all funded proposals are in the area of remedial reading, although remedial reading often has not been effective. Should the coordinator reject such proposals on the

Conference Director Picott and H.E.W. Secretary Gardner greet the Vice President.

basis of past experience? One panelist likened it to "prescribing a larger dose of what we know doesn't cure."

Another panelist concluded: "There has been standardization of how to go about the job of writing proposals, but a lot of pedestrian stuff has been approved. What is needed now is encouragement and stimulation to get truly innovative ideas, because our old ways of educating fall a long way short."

Panel IB

One delegate claimed that in his area teachers were using Title I remedial classes as a dumping ground for their problem students, just as they had used vocational classes provided under the Smith-Hughes Act. Another delegate worried that it might not be possible to dislodge faulty crash programs if they were once established.

Yet others were enthusiastic. Title I funds had enabled them to deal with elementary and obvious problems. "First things first" was the attitude of a rural Georgian school superintendent. We can see which children are suffering from malnutrition, he said, and feed them. We can find out who stay away from school because they lack warm clothes, and clothe them. We can provide glasses. Children are smart and they can learn. There is money now for books and libraries. Parents are a problem, but we are finding ways to involve them, such as recreational programs and visits from school people. His county, he said, was so backward "the June bugs come in October," but parents would be reached by sending a school visitor to homes, "sitting on the back porch with them swatting flies, drinking buttermilk, and bragging on it. We'll have a change before we know it."

Panelist Edmund W. Gordon, professor of educational psychology and guidance, Yeshiva University, agreed that many of the obvious but ordinary things that are being done are indeed good. He would not demean them, but he would point out that they are directed at equalizing educational opportunity, and while that too is good, he suspected the crucial problem goes beyond that. Giving food and clothing, medical care, books, even little allowances permitting some to participate who might not otherwise, does equalize educational opportunity. It will make some difference. But it may not be sufficient to compensate for the deficiences of the background from which the disadvantaged child comes. Head Start, a tremendous innovation, may reduce the gap between the advantaged and the disadvantaged. But equalizing the opportunities, he said, will not compensate for the differences. We should go beyond equal opportunity to specialized opportunity. Dr. Gordon was worried that current efforts may prove to be both insufficient and inappropriate. "We did not cure the plague with blood letting. We did not cure TB by drinking milk."

Panel IIIB

A number of the participants felt that the first year of Title I has "produced money for action," and that it has already changed attitudes. Victor J. Podesta, superintendent of schools, Vineland, N.J., said that prior to the passage of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act "there was little action in the classroom. Teachers had been conditioned to expect failure, and had little outside contact with the problems of the disadvantaged. Title I provided health care and food service; it lengthened the schoolday and decreased class size. Title I gave us money to shake up programs and gave status to teaching the disadvantaged. You could always hire teachers for Evergreen School (a middle-class school), but if you mentioned Lincoln School (disadvantaged), candidates would immediately become interested in the next town."

Panelist Evans Clinchy, director of the Office of Program Development of the Boston Public Schools, described plans for a model demonstration subsystem within the Boston system, an attempt not at developing scattered special programs for disadvantaged children but at reshaping all aspects of a school, experimenting with curriculum, differing teaching styles, and new materials. The subsystem is now centered in one elementary and one junior school but will eventually be extended to the senior-high level. It includes trials with nongraded instruction, cultural enrichment, the development of close contact with parents and community, intensive work in language and arithmetic, and the provision of special resources and instruction in art, music, and dance (eurythmics). Ultimately, it is hoped, the trials in the subsystem will influence practices in other Boston schools and provide models for general change.

Among other projects described were—

- Provision of mobile classrooms, each with separate living quarters for a teacher, to bring special services to the scattered rural areas of North Dakota. (Vivian Nordby, county superintendent of schools, Amidon)
- A special program in biology for ninth graders from rural schools conducted at a university in Puerto Rico. (Ismael Velez, director, Biology Department, San German)
- A demonstration project in Danbury, Conn., focused on early childhood education, adult education, vocational training and special programs for the disadvantaged, employing rented construction project trailers specially equipped by the school system, and using nonprofessionals as teacher aides. (Ernest E. Weeks, assistant superintendent of schools, Danbury)
- An intensive remedial reading program at Virginia State College for the first-year students from disadvantaged schools, using closed-circuit television and other media, reported to have raised reading levels 4 years in a year's duration. (Harry Johnson, Virginia State College, Petersburg)
- Provision of special equipment and study facilities for remote schools in Alaska; at the University of Alaska, anthropology courses to train teachers for work in such schools. (Mrs. Winifred D. Lande, assistant director for State-operated Schools, Juneau)
- A cluster of 23 projects in Minneapolis, including free breakfast and lunch programs for disadvantaged children, the use of teacher aides and home visitors, and the institution of a special noncredit summer school in which teachers "don't have to cover any body of material, they just teach." (Donald Bevis, director of special Federal projects, Minneapolis)
- The institution of summer remedial reading and enrichment programs, and the use of a mobile dental unit which, in 1965–66, served 1,000 children in Little

Rock, Ark. (Paul Fair, deputy superintendent of schools, Little Rock)

- The Michigan State Department of Education has contracted with the State universities for consulting assistance in technical services for local districts, and is conducting an inservice program for its own staff. (Louis Kocsis, chief, elementary and secondary education, State Department of Education, Lansing)
- Use of private preparatory schools for summer enrichment programs. (Edward Yeomans, National Association of Independent Schools, Boston, Mass.)
- Establishment of ungraded programs, introduction of a variety of special services, and the enlistment of community involvement in a pilot elementary school project at the Cleveland School, Washington, D.C. The hope is that through the institution of ungraded groups the necessity for remedial reading programs will be eliminated since all children may progress at their own speed. (Mrs. Lorraine F. Bivins, supervisor of Cleveland Elementary School, D.C. Public Schools, Washington)
- The "lighted schools" of Rochester, N.Y., involving afterschool and evening programs conducted in churches and other facilities outside school buildings. Participants include college students and other volunteers. The program focuses on reading instruction for disadvantaged children and adults, including family reading programs in which parents are taught to read to their young children. (Mrs. Alice Young, administrator, Title I, ESEA, City School District, Rochester)

A number of these programs derived support from several sources. Connecticut, for example, has provided State funds that supplement Title I allocations.

There appeared to be a feeling that Title I has provided opportunities never before available, that necessary action can now be taken.

The School Views the Child—and Vice Versa

Panel IIB

Panelist Max Birnbaum, director of the Human Relations Laboratory, Boston University, put the overall problem in these terms:

"What we are now being asked to do is to find new and untried ways of inducing the disadvantaged sections of the population to defer substantial gratification over a long period of time—even past college or graduate school—and to substitute the pleasures derived from school achievement for those which correspond more immediately to life needs.

"The crucial question really is: How can we expect a lower class population to adopt—overnight—middle-class values which accept deferment of immediate needs gratification in order to achieve a delayed and profitable reward? The absence of this middle-class pattern of behavior has led many teachers to conclude that these children are 'ineducable.' "

Mr. Birnbaum added, "Our most difficult problem is that school principals, teachers, and other education leaders confront situations which their previous training has not equipped them to handle confidently or constructively."

Another panelist, Edward Zigler, professor of psychology, Yale University, noted in the same vein: "Disadvantaged children are not motivated by what the middle class takes for granted. The lower class child needs immediate and tangible reward. We need a cadre of experts who understand the poor. I have been struck by the numbers of people who think they *own* the poor, not just understand them."

Civil rights leader James L. Farmer, president of the Center for Community Action Education, Washington, D.C., also spoke of the alienation of the disadvantaged child. "In the Negro ghettos," he said, "you often hear the people say of themselves, 'The nigger ain't nuthin.' The disadvantaged youngster cannot identify with the world outside the ghetto."

"We are dealing," Dr. Zigler said, "with the child who expects to fail, who has no confidence. It is a reflection of his whole stance toward life."

Panel IIIA

In his presentation, Edward B. Fort, Division of Instruction, Detroit Public Schools, concentrated on what he called "attitudinal predeterminism." Teachers and administrators, he contended, hold attitudes that work against disadvantaged children learning in school. One prevailing attitude, he said, is that many Negro children are intellectually inferior and therefore cannot compete. This becomes a self-fulfilling prophecy as the child lives up to the teacher's expectations.

Another thesis is that children from the inner city need a different kind of education. They do not have the opportunity to behave as normal kids. They are given "social promotions" and watered-down curriculum. The student, in turn, quickly learns the "poor child syndrome" and blames his environment for his inability to learn or even try.

Dr. Fort suggested a variety of moves to change such attitudes:

- Programs should be established with curriculums relevant to students' real interests.
- Increased levels of expectation for children should be built into Title I projects. (He cited the example of a class in San Francisco where the teacher was told that the students' IQs were much higher than they actually were. In the experiment, the students' IQs actually improved as much as 10–20 points.)
- Administrators and teachers should learn more about the backgrounds of the children and treat them as individuals.
- A control system should be set up to avoid weakness, overindulgence, mistrust, and hostility on the part of teachers toward disadvantaged students.

One participant suggested that the issue raised by panelist Fort is hostility and no programmatic change is going to attack it. Another suggested that academic retardation of the disadvantaged is a fact. The teacher is put in the position of being either weak or punitive. "We have to face the fact and then get to the point of where we go from here."

Others felt that some teachers expect far too much of children. For instance, seventh graders who cannot read primers still use seventh-grade books. "The teacher should know the structure of what she teaches so that she can work with the child at whatever level of ability he presents."

Another participant said: "We need help on how to think outside of stereotypes about the disadvantaged.

There is an enormous range among homogeneous groups of kids. We need a better understanding of individual differences and of which differences don't make any difference."

Panel IB

Philip M. Hauser, professor of sociology, University of Chicago, included schools in his list of social and political handicaps borne by the disadvantaged child. He traced the Negro's inadequate preparation for urban life, moved through the "civil disobedience of State legislatures" (malapportionment and most State housing and civil rights legislation), the political fragmentation of metropolitan areas making the suburbs an escape hatch for whites, a widespread lack of interest more serious than bigotry, segregation, and unequal opportunity (adding that schools contribute to the stratification of society), inadequate resources given education ($500 per child instead of $1,000), the "rigor mortis" of the school establishment, the "timidity" of the Federal Government in facing Northern segregation, the lack of resources ("and sometimes even the will") in the Office of Education, and finally, the child himself. "If you focus on the child only," Dr. Hauser concluded, "you will still have the problem a generation from now."

Just what the focus should be was a matter of concern to many. Msgr. Arthur J. Geoghegan, superintendent of schools, Diocese of Providence, R.I., felt the problems of the disadvantaged were primarily the schools' business. "It is an instructional problem," he said. "The children are well motivated when they come."

"We're not beginning right," said a delegate from the Virgin Islands. "We're beginning with the child. We should begin with the parents." "We're starting too late," agreed another, who felt Title I will prove only a stopgap measure, a weak band-aid, if nothing else is done. The Office of Economic Opportunity and the Welfare Administration, he felt, should be stepping in before the child comes to school.

Just what the focus should be was a matter of particularly grave concern to panelist Gordon. He had recently finished a study (for the College Entrance Examination Board, to be published in September) of compensatory education for the disadvantaged that had left him "kind of troubled." He was afraid the thinking behind the problems of the disadvantaged was inappropriate. It is true, he agreed, that their problems are related to the structure of society, "but if we focus most on extra-educational problems, those we are least prepared to deal with, some of the more basic pedagogical problems may be missed." If educators were to act too much as "amaetur sociologists" they would fail to do a good job in their real area of competence. We tend to talk about the characteristics of the disadvantaged across the board, he said, as if there were no variations among them. Yet there are great variations. Some interfere with their education, some occur frequently enough to merit generalization, but few are really useful to planning. He spoke of rehabilitation hospitals where the principal facilities are programs for diagnosis. By contrast, "we have not yet begun to specify special programs for special children."

Disorganization in the child's family and in his work at school seem to go together, he agreed, but there is little the schools can do about family disorganization. The focus should be on education, on reading level, "on the problems we should know something about." Yet, although it is clear that new kinds of learning approaches would be more appropriate for the disadvantaged than the basic curriculum, "there have been few new approaches to basic learning." He wondered if pedagogy has let itself become too distracted by other things. He suspected it is not trying to find new approaches.

Panel IA

Panelist Pearl accused the schools of failure to define "tolerable deviance—all differences are deprecated" and of dealing with rule violators (behavior problems) by "segregating them out of the system. Punishment is not an effective deterrent, but we operate in the schools as if this were the only basis for controlling behavior."

"What we have engaged in is a massive self-delusionary system, part of which is the basis that we think we are doing something for kids. And most of what the school does right now . . . doesn't prepare them for the world in which we live today, doesn't even prepare them for the world that existed 30 years ago . . . and certainly isn't preparing for the world of tomorrow."

Panelist Philip Montez pointed out the particular problem that the bilingual child has in the school system saying that the schools refuse to accept the reality that thousands of American children cannot speak English when they are in kindergarten or first grade. "To ignore this reality is to predoom these children to failure. And educational statistics prove this is exactly what we are doing."

Wilson C. Riles, panel chairman, director of compensatory education, California State Department of Education, summed it up this way: "Teachers do the kind of job society demands and expects and they have done that well. But for the disadvantaged, society has not demanded that anything be done."

Panel IIIB

Hyman H. Frankel, director, Special Project on Human Development, Southern Illinois University, asserted that until the last decade "we could feel comfortable with our middle-class values and attitudes. Now teachers and administrators are being asked to perceive cultural differences and are asked to understand that old measures are ineffective indexes of learning ability. The burden of responsibility for the failure to learn has shifted from the child to the school. Teachers and administrators must bear the brunt of this change." Acceptance of responsibility for Title I projects, he said, requires a new set of attitudes reflecting the belief that "the ability of children to learn is limited only by our skills as teachers and administrators." If attitudes cannot be changed, he added, "then narrow middle-class professionalism will return."

Panel IIA

Misconceptions of the children's abilities have resulted from false interpretations of standard tests, said Paul I. Clifford, professor of education, Atlanta University. He advised delegates not to abandon the tests, but recommended "their proper and relevant use within the most demanding confines of professional competence, ethics, and maturity." He suggested that, in light of the knowledge that these children are likely to respond differently, results of standardized tests are likely to reveal not the child's maximum capabilities, but "what and how much the child has been able to learn in spite of an environmental handicap." They reflect the "pathology of the minority culture" and the "floors of the child's capabilities," he noted, while, in reality, the "child's capabilities are infinite."

In a separate discussion, the panel considered the possible negative effects of segregation on the educational process. Dr. John A. Morsell, associate director of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, said a recent study by OE in compliance with section 402 of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 will

Paul I. Clifford discusses a strategy for action with conferees at the IIA group meeting. Others seated at the head table are (left to right) Barbara Kemp, Marvin G. Cline, Don Davies, John A. Morsell, James E. Mauch, and Thomas W. Pyles (Chairman).

"exert a profound effect upon the course of thought and planning for education of the disadvantaged. It may well be the most important piece of educational research of our lifetime," he added, noting that the study confirms the pervasiveness of segregated education in every region of the country. The report, he stated, makes it plain that segregated Negro schools are on the whole inferior instructional institutions, and that "if a minority pupil from a home without much educational strength is put with schoolmates with strong educational backgrounds, his achievement is likely to increase."

One pupil-attitude factor, he said, appears to have a stronger relationship to achievement than to all other school factors together. This is the extent to which an individual feels he has some control over his own destiny. Among Negroes, Dr. Morsell said, "this characteristic is related to the proportion of whites in the schools. Those Negroes in schools with a high proportion of whites have a greater sense of control."

Marvin G. Cline, assistant director, Institute for Youth Studies, School of Medicine, Howard University, commented that without breaking up the ghetto school, the "child of the ghetto will never be sure that he is seriously expected to enter the wider society; that the real standards of the wider culture are being applied to him; and that his successes are true successes in the true world of the whites and not in the debilitating twilight world of the ghetto." Dr. Cline urged that the central task of Title I is the break-up of the ghetto. "Segregation is a form of miseducation," another panelist stated.

Panel IVB

Panelist Adron Doran, president, Morehead State College, pointed out that special aid for education of disadvantaged children was an issue at the time the Economic Opportunity Act was under consideration. Back in 1964, attempts were made to extend school aid to federally affected areas to include children of families receiving aid to dependent children for unemployment compensation. He also pointed out that the pattern of behavior of economically disadvantaged families is oriented toward: (1) individualism rather than mutualism; (2) traditionalism rather than innovation; (3) fatalism rather than creativity; and (4) being passive recipients rather than active agents.

Dr. Doran went on to emphasize that "teachers and administrators must be trained in the colleges and universities to: (1) understand the individuals and groups with whom they must work in the educational process; (2) discover and accept new ways of working with groups and teaching children; (3) seek new ways and means of involving the families of the disadvantaged children as resources in the educative process; and (4) learn better how to utilize and train noncertified personnel to assist in the affairs of the classroom."

James Wilson, Director, Indian Branch, OEO, implored the assembled educators to recognize that the children of poverty think differently, have different needs and experiences, and are essentially different people. But Dr. Wilson cautioned the group not to be too quick in their judgments. He recounted the events of his childhood on an Indian reservation. He noted that the dirt roof of the log cabin in which he was reared was adorned with flowers 25 years before the national beautification program was conceived.

How Much Can Schools Really Do?

Panel IIB

Panel chairman Austin Haddock, director of Public Law 89–10, Oregon State Department of Education, in his opening remarks noted that the problem is a horrendous one now and is going to get worse.

"By 1976, if the population projections are at all accurate," Dr. Haddock said, "60 percent of our population will be 18 years of age or under. Some 50 to 60 percent of the population between 18 and 22 will be in colleges of one kind or another. This means roughly that some 75 to 80 percent of the population will be under the direct physical control of the Nation's educators.

"Are we ready for this awesome responsibility?" Haddock asked. "Obviously not. If we thought we were, we wouldn't be here."

Dr. Zigler emphasized the need for much more provision under Title I for the kind of experience that takes children out of the school so that they can have a good time and learn through the gratification of new experiences. "We need to think in terms of something in addition to what we are doing which does not put a heavy burden on the youngster. It should be indirectly related to the school so that he goes back to school feeling that the school is more than just being confined in the classroom and working for grades."

According to Carl Marburger, Assistant Commissioner for Education, Bureau of Indian Affairs, a critical issue is that of institutional change. Unless the institution of the school is adaptable to innovative practices and new programs, we simply phase these children back into the system and the same kinds of things take place over and over again.

Charles Benson, professor of education, University of California at Berkeley, stated that studies have been made which demonstrate that you do not move quickly from an expenditure to some observable change in pupil behavior. Outcomes are dependent upon a number of variables and we must be able to determine which combinations of activities yield results. Possibly it is necessary to work on certain strategic community variables like housing and employment.

Panelist Marburger noted the demise of Higher Horizons, the exemplary compensatory education project which is now defunct. "I think it is important for us to take a hard look at our compensatory education programs and examine precisely what we are doing. Unless we bring evaluation and research to bear upon what we are doing, our own programs can go down the drain the way Higher Horizons did."

Panel IIIB

There was fundamental disagreement within the room regarding the past performance of American education; and on the degree that change was necessary. Chairman P. J. Newell, Jr., assistant commissioner, Division of Instruction, Missouri State Department of Education, asserted that "American school systems have been a great success." American education, he said, has lacked resources and some children have therefore "been shortchanged." But, he added, "we have a system that we can be proud of, that can take its place in the world." The entire Title I program, he pointed out, "provides specific funds for specific kids in specific areas. We cannot restructure all of education with those funds even if we wanted to. We can hope to make great strides as more funds become available.

Panelist Robert L. Green, director of education for the Southern Christian Leadership Conference, asserted that the educational system "has been a sorry failure," that it has been "set up systematically to make second-class citizens of Negro children." Dr. Green said that "we have created disadvantaged youth. Short-term solutions are a waste of time. The issue is not merely the attitudes of teachers and administrators, it is the American attitude." He proposed that teachers and school adminisrators begin to take leadership not merely in education, but in molding community attitudes on housing, employment, and other social issues affecting the life of the Negro.

Panelist Marvin Rich, executive director of the Scholarship, Education, and Defense Fund for Racial Equality, asserted that most enrichment programs fail because they are fragmentary and irrelevant, and that most of the pilot projects "attempt to make the Negro child like white America. That child has to make it in the context of his own identity. We have to modify the existing curriculum, not add to it. We need better guidance from the earliest grades. We need materials more geared to urban life, material on civil rights, Negro history, African culture. The disadvantaged children fail because there is no reason to succeed. Given those conditions, apathy is the only proper response." And, he added, American schools are failing for the nondisadvantaged, too: "Both groups are disadvantaged by an outmoded educational system."

Mrs. Marie Duke, director of the Coordinating Council on Education of the Disadvantaged, New York, asserted further that all separate local and State efforts are insufficient. "We need a massive onslaught nationally," she said. "The problem has a horrible uniformity throughout the country. We have to bridge the gap between local, State and national efforts. With the mobility of the population this is a national responsibility. Let's start now and go to the public and inform them that the schools have to prepare children for the society as it is changing. Let's not begin with our own little separate problems."

Panel IA

The conferees agreed that not enough is being done, yet views ranged from "We've done nothing" to "We are doing *something* right."

At one extreme was panelist Pearl: "We've done nothing. Most of the things we have done are wrong. What we have is cholera. The only thing is, some people survive it. We have no basis for preparing people for the world in which we live. We think we're doing something for kids but we don't prepare them even for the world of 30 years ago."

Dr. Pearl suggested four major goals of education: (1) To guarantee every citizen a wide range of career choice. (2) To provide every citizen with the skills necessary for them to fulfill the duties of a citizen in a complicated democratic society. (3) To provide everyone with the basis of being culture carriers. ("When we take a look about us and recognize that Bat Man is the most important cultural contribution that took place in this country last year, we recognize how desperately education has failed in this respect.") (4) To provide people with the psychological strength necessary to survive in a mass society. Dr. Pearl felt that in none of these four areas were the schools anywhere close to reaching a simple minimal standard.

At the other extreme was Jack McIntosh, director of compensatory education for the Texas Education Agency: "The impression is being left that nothing good is being done. I think that something is being done today, we're making progress."

Mr. McIntosh cited Texas programs in which an effort is being made to instill an appreciation of Mexican culture and of those things in it that ought to be preserved and in which bilingualism in children is held as an asset, not a liability.

Similarly, William H. Moore, Title I coordinator for the Arkansas State Department of Education, pointed to imaginative use of Title I funds in an Arkansas school system to help overcome community resistance to school integration.

Significantly, the conferees rejected suggestions that separate schools or school systems be created to deal with the special problems of the disadvantaged. The poor already have experienced too much segregation, they concluded, and a separate system would do little or nothing to help them.

"We have our schools," said Howard Heding, professor of education, University of Missouri. "All we have to do is make them work for all."

Suggestions included an adult basic education program that would help poverty families understand the educational needs of their children, programs of community involvement in school planning, and use of Title I funds to aid school boards in gaining community acceptance of programs for the disadvantaged.

Educators, it was suggested, number some 2.3 million and represent a significant power potential in American society. "They will have to exercise that power," said one conferee.

Panel IIIA

The degree to which the schools have the responsibility for breaking the cycle of poverty came in for discussion on the final morning of the conference. It was generally agreed that it is not the sole responsibility of the schools, which must work with other agencies.

This led to a discussion of the role of Title I in accomplishing desegregation. One participant pointed to the danger present if projects are used to prolong racial segregation. "To what extent is it within the coordinators' prerogatives to see how projects address themselves to segregation?" he asked.

Several participants stated their belief that the act is for the disadvantaged who need help, no matter who they are. Another point of view, using Commissioner Howe's speech of the previous evening as evidence, felt

Group IIIA listens intently to a question from the floor. Seated at the panelists' table (l. to r.): Kay Earnhardt, John Henry Martin, Mildred Fitzpatrick (Chairman), A. Harry Passow, Peter G. Kontos, and Edward B. Fort.

the intent of Title I should be to bring children of different backgrounds together. (One participant said the Commissioner should "put his regulations where his speeches are.") In support of that thesis, another participant noted the triple coincidence of educational deprivation, racial segregation, and economic deprivation. And further support came from another who said, "There is good educational justification for projects that have built-in integration elements." Yet another noted a danger in Title I projects that create "separate-but-equal" education in the cities by having "too much happening in the ghettos."

Panel IB

The discussion group was in partial agreement on the political and social causes that have produced the disadvantaged child. It agreed on the administrative problems encountered in bringing him help, and in its identification of specific educational problems such as teacher attitudes and learning difficulties. But when it came to the heart of the matter—whether the new programs initiated were going to help—agreement fell away.

"What troubles me most about the disadvantaged," said a panel member "is that 5 years from now, when we look back and have to account for all the money we have spent, we may discover we really haven't solved the problem. Some may conclude nothing can be done."

"We're on the road," said a delegate from Wyoming. "I think in a few years we'll be there."

Frank L. Stanley, Jr., associate director for education, National Urban League, felt that among all the major institutions of the country, only the schools "have not moved to apply equality of opportunity." Thus, he said, "they may be the major force for resegregation in America." His associate, Mrs. Harriet Reynolds, assistant director, Education and Youth Incentives, National Urban League, felt the school system can not be changed from within. Only outside pressure, "conferences like this and Federal bribes to make them teach who they're supposed to teach anyway" will help. ("Isn't there something good about our educational system?" delegates asked.)

A delegate from rural Georgia thought there would be chaos in his country if the Title I program were stopped. He could see the benefits. He believed there would be change.

Others were more pessimistic. "I'm not sure that U.S. education is as effective as we like to think," panelist Gorden said. "We may have erased illiteracy in good measure, but we do not have a literate population. In terms of what has been needed for survival in the past, the schools have met their responsibility." For the future, however, Dr. Gordon thought, the kinds of liberal arts courses that seem to be a luxury today will be necessary simply for survival.

Training and Reorientation of Teachers

Panel IIB

How does a teacher teach a child whose basic reaction is to reject him?

That question in all of its ramifications cropped up repeatedly in panel IIB. Although there was some disagreement as to details, there was no question that teachers must be especially prepared for the tasks they face in dealing with alienated children. The group called not only for better original preparation, but for continuous inservice training.

As Larry Cuban, director of the Cardozo Project in Urban Teaching, Cardozo High School, Washington, D.C., pointed out, "Business has retraining programs going on all the time, but teacher education doesn't." Teacher internship, he said, must be a real marriage of academic work and classroom training.

Panelist Farmer commented that teachers have the most difficult and most critical jobs in our society at this time. "A teacher's empathy for students is vitally important," he said. "A sense of contempt on the part of the teacher rubs off very easily on pupils. The students themselves will become more involved with learning, have more confidence in themselves, if they believe the teacher thinks that they are important. And, the more identity there is between the teacher and the student, the easier it is for the teacher to teach."

Farmer touched off a heated reaction when he told the panel: "We are in a war. In a war, generals can't allow lieutenants to decide where they will fight. Teachers ought to be assigned to the places where they can do the best job."

There was no argument about the necessity of getting first-rate teachers into ghetto schools. There was general disagreement, however, with Farmer's proposal that they be assigned there, whether they like it or not.

Homer Cooper, director, Social Science Research Institute, University of Georgia, declared: "One of the few freedoms teachers have is that of mobility. They must be free to come and go, they shouldn't be trapped. We must find ways to motivate teachers to want difficult assignments, but we shouldn't let superintendents assign them there."

David Selden, assistant to the president, American Federation of Teachers, said: "Teachers will be reluctant to enter the profession or stay in it if they fear they'll be assigned where they can't succeed. You can't keep them where they will be continually confronted by failure. Give them a decent school, where they can succeed, and they'll stay there. This is a long-range problem which can't be solved with gimmicky arrangements."

Panelist Zigler called the assignment of teachers to the slums, as proposed by Farmer, "self-defeating." "Psychologists have shown," he said, "that the most common reaction to frustration is aggression. In this case it would be aggression against the children, a most harmful thing to the youngsters in their charge. . . . We've got to retrain teachers to have different goals for different children. America doesn't run on Harvard and Yale graduates but on high school graduates. I would like to see teachers flock to these schools because they understand the disadvantaged children and their problems, and then they will find success."

Mr. Cuban pointed out, "The earlier you take the preservice student going into education and work with him, the better retention rate you will have."

In the Cardozo project in the District of Columbia, Cuban said, "four interns are assigned to one master teacher. With a constant dialogue between the interns and the master teachers, we are able to telescope some years of training."

Charles Benson wondered whether, since teachers "must live on success," we might try to redefine the criteria of success toward the end that it is measured less in academic performance of college-bound students, less on getting a certain number in a good college, and more in taking a class of children who are not performing well and trying to raise them substantially from that point.

Mr. Selden pointed out, "A basic problem of slum schools is the shortage of teachers, but there is a tendency to evade it. We can't substitute a collection of teacher aides."

Mr. Cuban suggested making "the inner-city school attractive—not with just more money and small classes—but by making it a professional institution, make it attractive professionally. We should make the inner city school a curriculum center and inservice training area where teachers would want to go."

To this Mr. Farmer replied: "We can't afford to wait until the schools become attractive and the teachers volunteer to go to the ghetto schools. Some of those who volunteer now do so because they think they can relate to these alienated children—but they can't. A superintendent who assigns teachers to those schools can watch them and learn from them, and then make other assignments if necessary."

Mr. Birnbaum suggested that perhaps one solution might be to get teachers as a group to volunteer for service in the inner city schools, and find success as a group where they might not as individuals.

How should teachers of the disadvantaged be prepared?

Morris F. Epps, superintendent of schools, New Brunswick, N.J., said, "The real training of these teachers has to take place inservice."

Glyn Morris, director of Title I, Board of Cooperative Educational Services, Lyons Falls, N.Y., agreed: "There *has* to be inservice training. The teachers don't get what they need in teachers college. They get these kids in the classroom and want them to talk—and the kids just don't know how to verbalize."

There was general agreement when William L. Lewis, general supervisor of Federal programs in Gary Public Schools, Indiana, suggested that there needs to be inservice training for administrators, too, particularly with regard to title I.

But on the general subject of inservice training, panelist Selden warned: "For Heaven's sake, let's don't get into the rut we were in 20 to 30 years ago when inservice training was a kind of degree-credit mill."

Panel IB

Dr. Hauser asserted that teachers are too middle class to communicate with the disadvantaged ("middle-class persons trained in middle-class institutions"). He felt the solution is to change their curriculum, give them enough social science, history, and psychology so they can understand the background of the disadvantaged child, and train them in the disadvantaged areas with the disadvantaged children. A delegate from Connecticut thought this oversimplified, that a few additional courses would not help. "The problem is the teacher's motivation," he said, and that is formed before their training begins. Teachers, he said, are too security conscious.

The notion that teachers are middle class, said Mrs. Reynolds, is a myth. They are newly middle class, not secure, afraid to look back, afraid to rock the boat, afraid to relate to the lower class from which they have just emerged. Yet the use of volunteer teachers who might relate is blocked by the educational system. She rebutted criticism from school authorities who complained that Title I came too late in the year for them to hire the people they wanted. "You limited yourselves to certified teachers," she said, adding that in Indiana the school authorities hired retired teachers to help with dropouts, the ones whose very techniques had caused the schools to lose these students in the first place.

"We have to stay within the law," said a State delegate.

"We have to change the laws," replied Mrs. Reynolds.

One of the delegates, who felt with Kenneth B. Clark, professor of psychology, City College of New York, that the teacher's attitude is "the critical factor" in reaching the disadvantaged child, wanted to know what is being done about it. She was told of workshops in Indiana, where it is felt changes in attitude are taking place, of programs in Virginia, now in their second year, where teachers are learning to recognize their attitudes and discovering their effect on teaching, and of teachers in Fort Sill, Okla., who themselves requested inservice training.

A delegate from Indiana said counties there had stretched the guidelines a bit, working with the teachers first to develop understanding, and waiting until fall to start programs.

One delegate drew a parallel. "We had this problem with teaching the mentally retarded for years. Now teachers of the mentally retarded have status. Ghetto teachers don't." Another held universities should share the blame.

There were those who felt they have no problem with teacher motivation. One was in charge of disadvantaged schools. Our teachers are willing, he said, we're holding no gun in their back. "And the young ladies who come out of the colleges you criticize," he added, "are bringing many valuable new techniques."

But a superintendent from Mississippi felt that teacher orientation is a problem. "We don't change people overnight," he said, and disagreed with those who think the superintendents are responsible by not taking the lead. "I work for the school board. I don't know who you work for," he said to his critics. Change will come but it will have to be a matter of degree. "We cannot afford to disrupt the education program or we will defeat the very people we are trying to help. We have to go slowly. I don't please the civil rights groups. I don't please the white groups either."

A delegate from Wyoming also felt it is a matter of degree, and that they are "on the road toward attitude change." In one group of teachers, each had promised to work this year with the worst pupil in her class. Next year, it would be with the worst two or three.

But a man who had taught for a year in a Boston slum school was pessimistic. "The teachers there are defeated, disappointed, both the young and the old." Only 3 out of 40 can be said to have enthusiasm. As a result, he would not want to pick teachers at random to teach the disadvantaged. "In Boston, we have to choose carefully where the money goes."

Panelist Gordon felt the answer lies not so much in attitudes as in providing the teacher with effective methods. "If one puts methodolgy in the hands of teachers, it probaby has a stronger impact than exhortation," he said. It is possible to talk to people and to touch them, he agreed. It is also possible that acquainting teachers with the background lives of the disadvantaged would have some effect. "When a teacher is helped to succeed, she loses her negative attitude." On the other hand, if she is faced with repeated failure, she will find it hard to retain any positive attitudes.

The key question remained, "Who is going to teach the teachers of the disadvantaged, and what are they going to teach?" Panelist Jacob Silverberg, chief psychologist, Memorial Guidance Clinic, said it is clear from experience in Richmond that there are not many people who know what to teach the teachers. Aside from courses in comparative culture, anthropology, and so on, "we still have to work directly with the child."

Panel IIA

Don Davies, executive secretary, National Committee on Teacher Education and Professional Standards, National Education Association, suggested that teacher preparation should be viewed as a whole, as a process which starts sometime in college, and continues through a period of supervised practice or internship, into the early and formative years, and throughout a teacher's career. He urged that teacher preparation be a joint responsibility of the school and the college, and that the concept of staff development be a broad one. It should include more than courses for credit and summer institutes; it should include a variety of planned activities (formal and informal), travel, independent study, work experience, work on curriculum and teaching materials, and, generally, be tailored to the needs of the individual teacher. He noted that many teachers in disadvantaged schools are alienated not only from their children but also from other members of the profession, and from the colleges and the community. "You don't change these deep-seated attitudes by lecturing to people about how they ought to love all the children." He urged that inservice programs be conducted within the community where the teacher works.

Dr. Davies suggested putting all teachers in disadvantaged schools on a 12-month contract and involving them heavily in developing strategy; setting aside 10 percent of Title I money for next year, and awarding it to individual teachers on the basis of proposals they submit for doing things in the classroom and community; supporting the concept of "the teacher and his staff" with the teacher as the central figure in a staff of supporting personnel, including teacher aides; limiting classroom activity of new teachers to no more than half time, the remaining time being devoted to study, and the observation and preparation of materials; and removing institutes for teachers of the disadvantaged from the university campus and putting them in slum schools in slum communities.

Panel IIIB

A number of speakers pointed out that education of disadvantaged children has always suffered from a lack of personnel and from the teacher's perennial difficulty in dealing with 30 or 35 children, meeting all curricular and administrative requirements, and simultaneously attempting to give individual attention to all pupils. "Teachers need time to do things," said Vernon A. Staggers, director of Federal programs for the Mineral County (W. Va.) public schools. "We need time to evaluate. I know that a teacher can do a better job with 20 kids than with 30." Although some of the panelists disagreed regarding optimum class size, there appeared to be no dissent from the ideas that teachers need extra help and that nonprofessionals can be used more widely and wisely.

Panel IVA

Jack W. Hanson, Title I administrator, Minnesota State Department of Education, said that until the job of teaching the disadvantaged is viewed in a more positive light the effort will continue to fail. "How in the world," he asked, "can we teach teachers to like kids who stink and swear and spit and with whom they can't identify?"

Panelist Dabney said that few undergraduate teacher-education programs stress anthropology courses to help teachers understand the disadvantaged. Instead, she said, teacher-education curricula help maintain society's overall rejection of the poor. "It's very impor-

Chairman John L. Cleveland (l.), John J. O'Neill, and Mario D. Fantini give attention to fellow panelist Margaret G. Dabney during the IV A discussion.

tant how the teacher perceives the child," she said, "because her perceptions are the facts out of which she operates."

Panelist Fantini also criticized teacher preparation. "I find that curriculum stocks up on content that tells us about the disadvantaged," he said. "Teachers come out and say, 'All right, I know that. Now, what do I do?' They still lack the technology of implementation."

Alva R. Dittrick, deputy superintendent of Cleveland, Ohio, schools, was more hopeful. "We have seen in Cleveland that you can change the attitudes of teachers," he said. "The key to it is staff development." Howe Hadley, dean, University of South Alabama, added that administrators, too, should receive inservice training in this area.

John W. Alberty, director of Title I, Missouri State Department of Education, said he was unconvinced that teachers are doing a bad job. "As long as we keep emphasizing what we're not doing, we're going to get a bad job," he said. "I don't mean that we should overlook the failures. But we should get enough space in the paper for what we're doing right as for what we're doing wrong."

Mrs. Dabney noted that "the whole teaching profession is having role and status problems. . . . Now teachers find themselves embattled. Their failures are submitted to public view. We need to help teachers overcome this threat." She added that "there is a high risk value in teaching, but the risks are hidden. It is a question of opening up life or not."

Panel IIIA

Several of the participants suggested ways to change teacher attitudes toward the deprived. One such change would involve setting up demonstration projects in schools and districts so that other teachers could see disadvantaged children actually learning with a good teacher. Teachers who are successful could be employed as models to work with other teachers. Another way would be for teachers to tell one another what works for them. "Every teacher has a little bit that works in a particular class. We need to put those pieces together."

Getting Help For Teachers

Panel IIIB

A major portion of the discussion centered on ways of opening schools not only to new ideas but to new people—teacher aides and other paraprofessionals—to relieve the regular staff of clerical and custodial duties. One participant urged that schools must stop acting as closed shops, fearful of community involvement and of the presence of nonprofessionals within academic walls.

Jarvis Barnes, assistant superintendent of the Atlanta public schools, said schools must come to accept the presence of subprofessionals as teacher aides and in other capacities. "We've been keeping them out," he said. "We've been trying to do too much." Such people, it was felt, would not only relieve teachers of clerical and custodial duties, they would also bring to the schools new insights and ideas. The panelists agreed that the social and economic backgrounds of nonprofessionals or paraprofessionals are not as important as a desire to work with disadvantaged youngsters and a training program for preparing them. Panelist Frankel said subprofessionals should be recruited and trained with a career orientation, that they should be carefully screened and evaluated, and that their use requires "the sustained involvement of administrative personnel."

Panel IIB

Panelist Cuban said that next year 30 boys, potential high school dropouts, will be trained as teacher aides at the elementary school level. They will be paid for their morning work, and their academic work in the afternoon will be related to their morning experience.

Panel IA

Perhaps the most unusual proposal came from panelist Pearl; he proposed using students as young as 16 years old as teachers, giving them advanced and professional education as they teach. In this way, he said, education would cultivate more and better teaching talent and at the same time open opportunities hitherto unavailable to the disadvantaged. Education and the Nation's other "growth industries"—health and welfare—will have to open such opportunities, he added, if the cycle of poverty is to be broken in our modern society.

Panel IIA

The group discussed whether it was best to recruit teacher aides from within the community or from the university. Most agreed it is sound to draw these people from the community. Participants were warned by several speakers, however, that these aides also must be exposed to a continuous program of inservice training if they are to play an effective role. "We run the danger of extending the incompetency of an incompetent teacher," one delegate warned. Speakers pointed out that one must deal with the fears of the teacher in accepting the aide into her classroom. One spokesman commented that teachers "have lived in splendid isolation most of their lives."

Panel IVB

R. C. Beemon, Title I coordinator, Georgia State Department of Education, told the group that paraprofessionals in the field of education lack adequate definition. The line between professional and paraprofessional activity seems unclear. Use of paraprofessionals such as teacher aides is frequently precluded by State certification regulations and policies.

This particular point was emphasized by Norman Brombacher, assistant superintendent of New York City public schools. Dr. Brombacher explained that the term "school aide" is used in New York to avoid possible conflict with the certification board. Even though New York's school aides do not engage in professional activity, there is fear that the certification board would claim jurisdiction if they were called teacher aides.

E. B. Stanley, division superintendent of schools, Washington County, Va., elaborated on his experience with teacher aides during the past year. In his school system, teacher aides were used to take care of bulletin boards, handle rental books, assist in recordkeeping, watch over the cafeteria, and supervise physical education as well as playground activities. Young women were employed because it was believed they could take directions more readily. Before undertaking their duties as regular teacher aides, the women were enrolled for an inservice training program. According to Mr. Stanley, the experience proved to be most satisfactory. The conclusion was reached that a good teacher can effectively utilize the services of a teacher aide. On the other hand, it was observed that a poor teacher won't benefit from an aide because such a teacher does not spend the necessary time planning to use the aide to good advantage.

Mrs. Marilynn S. Scott, a classroom teacher from Alaska, told of the use of library aides to good advantage. She emphasized that these aides are not used to process books but to help counsel children. When the use of aides was first suggested, the community action program people wanted to assign several aides to move tables and chairs and direct hall traffic. But the final program provided much more effective utilization of aides.

Alexander J. Plante, Title I coordinator, Connecticut State Department of Education, suggested it would be a wise move to establish a formal structure for both professionals and paraprofessionals in education. Various levels of professional standing could be created for teachers, specialists, and aides similar to the structure which now exists in the health professions. He suggested there might be a place for some sort of assistant teacher educated at the 2-year or associate degree level. He also suggested parents and other residents in the school neighborhood might contribute much as full- or part-time aides, performing such functions as would be compatible with their capabilities.

Samuel A. Madden, director, field services, Virginia State College, seconded the move for training of teacher aides at the college level, whereupon panelist Wilson announced that San Francisco Junior College already has a teacher-aide course. In addition Dr. Wilson noted that under the Head Start program, Arizona State University, Utah State University, and the University of South Dakota have been cooperating in a paraprofessional program including orientation, inservice training, and an advanced cycle.

What Approaches to Curriculum and Learning?

Panel IIA

Planning for the educationally disadvantaged, according to Dr. Irvamae Applegate, dean of education, St. Cloud State College, and president, National Education Association, "must not be thought of in terms of projects, but must be on a continuous basis if our premise is correct that these chilldren are having problems because of lacks in their environment outside the school. At this point," she continued, "it appears to me that we are not encouraging long-range planning nor a coordinated or total attack on the problems of the educationally disadvantaged children." She also noted she was "very disturbed by the emphasis on such terms as 'imaginative thinking' and 'innovation.' Far too many people have interpreted this to mean gimmick and there has grown up a vocabulary of magic words thought by many to be the 'Open Sesame' to getting project approval, not only under Title I of Public Law 89–10 but under other titles of the act, as well as other acts."

Panel IIIA

In the opening presentation, A. Harry Passow, chairman, Committee on Urban Education, Columbia University, identified some patterns that have emerged in educating the disadvantaged. He called them promising provided their substance as well as their form is adopted. Among those he mentioned were—

- Preschool and early childhood education aimed at compensating for deficits, especially those dealing with language and concepts.
- Remedial programs in the basic skills (which have far less chance of success, said the participants, than preventive or compensatory programs).
- Individual or small group programs using professional teachers, paraprofessionals, or volunteers. (Often the most dramatic changes come in the teachers or volunteers themselves, which may be one reason these programs are always termed successful.)
- Broad exploration of the curricular values in those parts of a student's life outside the classroom.
- Special programs to develop teaching materials.
- Staff changes, including adding specialized personnel and redeployment of present staff.
- Special guidance and counseling for students and parents.
- Reorganization of the school day and the school year, coupled with better school-community relations.
- Preservice and inservice teacher training programs centered around strategies of working with the disadvantaged.
- Techniques and procedures for correcting racial balance.

Too often, pieces of such programs have been tried, with little effort made to fit the pieces together into a total program. Also, these programs have begun to bring to light a variety of gaps and lags in education, according to Dr. Passow.

Some of the gaps and lags:

- In the absence of any sociological or psychological theory of understanding the deprived, concentration has been on isolated factors rather than on their interaction.
- Although few studies have been made and little is known about the effectiveness of early intervention programs, the tendency has been to put all our eggs in the preschool basket.
- Our knowledge of parent education is based almost entirely on what we know about the middle-class home.
- The relation of nonintellectual factors, such as parental pressure, is not known.
- There is no knowledge of how lower class children use language for educational development.
- There are no guides for the teacher in either the selection or evaluation of books and other materials.
- Little is known about class size or about appropriate ways to prepare those who will teach the disadvantaged.

Repeatedly, the participants brought up examples of teaching or of Title I projects that illustrate the tendency toward the safe and sterile. One such example was called the Ming Dynasty approach. During the 1965 Cleveland riot, a social studies teacher was trying to interest her class in a lesson on the Ming Dynasty. The class, understandably, was more interested in the riot just outside the windows of the classroom. In a determined effort to stick to her guns, the teacher finally resorted to lowering the shades, thus successfully avoiding an opportunity to capitalize on the student interest in a topic that fitted into her own field. It was even suggested that earlier concentration on such issues in Cleveland schools might have helped prevent such a riot.

There was little argument that reading presents the basic educational problem of the disadvantaged and that learning to read is the key to the rest of the curriculum.

Donald Cleland, professor of education, University of Pittsburgh, described the integrated experience approach to communication at the University of Pittsburgh, which concentrates on reading, listening, writing, speaking, perceiving, and understanding nonvocal signals. Since the disadvantaged child has often acquired an aural-oral repertoire that is foreign to the materials given him in school, other steps must be taken before introducing him to books. Such steps could involve movies, tape recorders, field trips, conversations, dictating stories to the teacher. In the Pittsburgh experiment, trade books rather than basal readers are used since they better meet the interests of the children.

The group agreed that there is no one method and no one group of materials that is best. The point is to get the child to read, whether textbooks, paperbacks, comic books, sports pages, or other printed material. In one experiment in Princeton, disadvantaged high school boys who could not read finally became interested through discussing questions that interested them.

One stumbling block to removing reading deficiencies is the lack of knowledgeable teachers, both for preventive and remedial programs. (There was agreement that remedial programs are seldom effective.)

In discussing attempts to teach children to read, John Henry Martin, superintendent of Mount Vernon public schools, New York, suggested that the schools do not take advantage of the child's early curiosity, do not give children the chance to do things for themselves or to teach each other; teachers do too much of the talking.

Mrs. Kay Earnhardt, coordinator of reading, Atlanta public schools, reporting an inservice training program in Atlanta, noted the following reasons teachers sometimes teach over the heads of students:

- Teachers are not aware that children do not learn things at the same rate. The teacher should be able to present her subject at whatever level the student is.
- Teachers cannot diagnose reading deficiencies and so do not know what is holding back a child.
- Materials for teaching reading to the disadvantaged are not adequate.
- If materials do not meet the requirements of the curriculum, the administrator will not let the teachers use them.

In the Atlanta program, some teachers learn how to make their own materials, making use of such things as the Beatles records (with their great emphasis on repetition). Fleets of "floating" teachers take the place of other teachers for a week's program in teaching reading. Eleven promising elementary school teachers were encouraged to get their certification as reading specialists.

In Colorado Springs, 14 teachers were given a 60-hour course in reading. They now are teaching other teachers.

In eastern Kentucky, inservice courses are provided, giving teachers the opportunity to see demonstration classes in the teaching of reading. Seventeen college faculty experts give the courses in the region. Subexperts then become available in each area.

On the matter of reading materials, Mrs. Earnhardt said they found some Head Start materials useful for higher grades so they have simply taken the grade labels off all materials.

In various ways, States are making use of college and university faculty to advise local districts on reading projects and to help with the training of teachers.

Panel IIB

Just as middle-class values do not apply in the ghetto schools, so instructional materials designed for middle-class children are out of place there. That was an area of general consensus in panel IIB.

"I'm concerned by the large illiteracy rate of the Negroes in this country," said panelist Farmer. "Many are functionally illiterate, including some high school graduates. Some high school students are reading at the third and fourth grade levels. This is due to many factors, including the family structure of the Negro in the slums, as some authorities have pointed out. But it also is due to flaws in the educational structure. I am convinced that a big factor in the inability of the deprived youngster to learn is the lack of relevance on the part of much of the instructional material to the lives of the people using it."

Morris Epps concurred: "There is a paucity of good materials and will continue to be unless American educators stand up to be counted. When I was teaching in the South, one thing that hurt me very much was that the materials were all designed for white children. There was nothing to indicate to the Negro child that he amounted to anything."

Both Epps and Farmer noted that some improvement has been made in providing multiethnic textbooks, and both urged that they be used in all schools, white, colored, and integrated. Farmer also said that textbooks are needed which give full and honest treatment to the historical backgrounds of the Indians, Puerto Ricans, and Spanish-Americans, as well as the Negroes. And he added: "Despite the recent improvements in textbooks, 'See Johnny Run' doesn't help at all."

Dr. Glyn Morris told the group: "We must look outside the school for those experiences which have made up the life of the disadvantaged child. We ought to help a deprived youngster verbalize his own experiences before we clobber him with Dick and Jane. Reading disability is a symptom of another problem. There has been too much emphasis on remedial reading as the sole solution. One extra month of reading in summer school isn't going to get the job done."

Panelist Benson noted that, for the first time, "no longer do we have a monolithic concept of educational financing. Now there is an effort to relate resources available with the requirements of children. But it is possible to fritter this extra money away in the traditional school system. Money spread out over many projects may not work. On the other hand, too rigid specialization may not work, either—for instance, in the case of remedial reading. Reading may be affected by hot breakfasts and field trips as much as by added time in the classroom with a reading specialist."

Panel IB

Perception difficulties of the disadvantaged child were discussed by the panel's psychologist, Jacob Silverberg, but the discussion group had few systematic approaches to overcoming them. Silverberg said a program developed by Frostig in California is very good, but does not go far enough. A new one coming out by Ayers will be broader, a systematic 2-year approach that will require no special materials and is psychologically sound. It was pointed out, however, that faulty perception *habits* have to be differentiated from perception disturbances that have a neurological basis. The Frostig system was a good system to use for the latter, but a different approach is needed for the former. Another delegate agreed that the most important thing to do is to develop programs for perception difficulties, but felt that perception differences are not as marked as language differences—"the next step, where the gap is greatest." He, too, felt the schools cannot do much about the social, historical, and political causes that have produced the disadvantaged child, but they can do something about the language problem. "This is where we have the tools." But, again, this is where a systematic approach is needed and lacking.

Panel IA

Charles Cogen, president of the American Federation of Teachers, criticized the trend in current Federal and other programs for the disadvantaged. There is, Mr. Cogen said, too much emphasis on innovation and supplementary and remedial programs and not enough emphasis on "basic improvements in education." He added that money is being wasted on "useless and excess equipment," and teachers are not being involved in the planning of programs. "What is needed," Mr. Cogen said, "is the expenditure of many more billions of dollars to reduce class size and to 'saturate' the schools with special services aimed at helping the disadvantaged and at easing teacher loads." New York City's "More Effective Schools" program was held up as an example of what could be accomplished.

If conferees agree that not enough is being done, what new things do they propose?

Rodney Tillman, assistant superintendent in charge of elementary education, Minneapolis public schools, called for an individualized instructional program. To accomplish this, he said, both instructional groupings and curriculum will have to be altered. But he cautioned against excessive dependence on new grouping patterns and called for greater attention to adaptation of the curriculum. The most important curriculum revision, he added, is one that will help the pupil develop "a positive and realistic picture of self. Every dropout has a negative image of self." In addition, he called for involvement of pupils in the setting of achievement goals, programs that foster divergent thinking, and programs that increase the scope of tolerance of all individuals.

The first point was elaborated on by Philip Montez who said that "we must begin to personalize education. I do not mean taking each child one at a time, but training teachers in sensitivity and the area of just being human."

Roy McCanne, Coordinator for Migrant Education, Colorado State Department of Education, was concerned with the educational problems that migrant children face in our schools today. He cited six of these problems: (1) A penetrating experience enrichment program is needed that provides teaching that helps the children to become more curious, to ask questions, to do some independent and critical thinking on their own. (2) There is a need to provide inservice

Panelists Jacob Silverberg (l.), Frank L. Stanley, Jr., Edmund W. Gordon, Donald T. Donley (Chairman), and Msgr. Arthur T. Geoghegan consult with Office of Education staff assistant, Ruthe Farmer, before group IB convenes.

training for teachers in teaching English as a second language and to motivate the child to learn English. (3) The migrant agricultural worker is the lowest paid category of worker in the United States and paid work experience must be provided to get the older youth into school and education in consumer economics is needed to educate the migrant family in effective buying. (4) Since migrant families move so often, many parents feel it is not worthwhile to send their children to school. The school must do constant recruiting to get the children to the schools and must develop a system for the transfer of school records. (5) Cultural behavior patterns differ from group to group and the school curriculum should include the study of cultural differences. (6) Many school districts make no provision for the groups of migrant children that come through their districts every year.

Panel IIIB

The group was told of efforts in New Jersey to give children some of the experiences taken for granted among middle-class families (How, for example, can a child comprehend the word "picnic," someone asked, if he has never been on one?), and of similar efforts in western Alaska to prepare Eskimo boys and girls for readers that assume a firsthand acquaintance with supermarkets and automobiles.

Most of the projects described included remedial reading and other language arts activities, some using the initial teaching alphabet, others employing the daily newspaper, still others drawing on specially prepared materials relevant to economically deprived children and adults.

The panel also heard of plans to provide cultural enrichment and recreational opportunities—outdoor education, inschool performances by professional drama groups, trips to concerts and museums. These programs, coupled with an increasing amount of counseling, are designed to broaden children's horizons and to preclude premature selection and rejection of social and vocational possibilities as well as to provide general cultural enrichment. "The point of elementary vocational counseling, beginning in the third grade," said one speaker, "is to encourage students to keep their minds open and not to close doors."

Panel IVA

The subject of tests and measurements as they affect disadvantaged children was a topic of considerable debate. Panelist Dabney said that "society is 'gung ho' on objective measurements. One problem is that we're ambivalent in society as to commitment to humanistic values." She said that educators ought to be concerned with this as they prepare tests.

Chairman Cleveland noted that "middle-class people have a greater motivation to pass a test. For kids in the [antipoverty, Title I] target area there is very little in society that makes them want to pass a test. There are other tests they can pass. They can fight and steal. They know how to make it."

Bert A. Goldman, associate professor of education, the University of North Carolina, said a major difficulty with measurements and tests is that teachers do not know how to use them or interpret them. "Few undergraduate courses at universities deal with tests and measurements," he said.

Mrs. Dabney said there is also a continuing need for new textbooks that will stimulate the disadvantaged child. "Many of the multicultural books I have seen are Dick and Jane in technicolor," she said, referring to the new "integrated" approach. Panelist Leonard B. Ambros, assistant director, American Textbook Publishers Institute, assured her that "textbook publishers are spending more money on research than ever before" in order to produce sound educational books that are also nondiscriminatory. "We're waiting for help from the field—what will work and what will not work," he said. "We're waiting for help from the educational fraternity."

Panelist James G. Banks, executive director, United Planning Organization, suggested that a good beginning is to ask the disadvantaged what they want in the products designated for their use.

Involving Parents and Community

Panel IIIA

Panelist Martin noted that "our pedagogy has worked only when there has been parental concern. The greatest Negro revolution is that mothers are now determined that their children are to get an education. That will make everything we do work."

Panelist Peter G. Kontos, professor of education, Princeton University, described a community action program in Cleveland that took place several years ago and in some ways was a forerunner of many of today's antipoverty projects. The idea stemmed from disadvantaged teenagers themselves who did not like what people in the community thought of them. They organized into a Youth Corps to do things in the inner city without pay. Of the 80 members of the Youth Corps, over 70 percent had never before been involved in anything, in or out of school. They developed their own projects, such as informing the community on how to get more police protection and better health services. Once it became known that they existed, they were booked solid for months in advance with projects that other community agencies wanted done. The youth became consultants to other clubs in town that wanted to reach the inner city community. The entire project cost $200 for 2 years. The significant change was in the youth themselves. A byproduct change was in the school curriculum which began to make use of the community as a laboratory.

Panel IVA

Panelist Donald P. Stone, assistant for education for the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee in Atlanta, Ga., argued that the poor themselves have resources which should be brought to bear on their problems. "We accept the logic that poor people have no answers to problems," he said. "If we didn't accept this logic some of those poor people would be here with us now." The fact that representatives of the poor are absent from the conference is a "demonstration of bankruptcy" in the meeting, Stone said.

He urged that "power be redistributed along more realistic lines so that the people affected have a way to make some of the decisions." He said school people ought to involve themselves "intimately in the lives of the people in a spiritual, not a materialistic, way. I have seen teachers totally uninvolved socially or any other way outside of the classroom," he said.

Asked by panelist Ambos, how educators can find the leaders of the poor, Stone said that when the schools become thoroughly involved they will see the people themselves come forth with leaders.

Consultant Sugarman noted that the schools are accustomed to dealing with groups which "gather together on a stable basis and have constant leadership," and that the poor have shifting allegiances to leaders among them. "It's most difficult to deal with groups that are here today and gone tomorrow," he said.

Chairman Cleveland reminded the participants that "there is no group to represent all Negroes, just as there is no group to represent all whites." The only solution to finding the leaders of the poor is to "go out and get to know the people ourselves," he said. Panelist Stone added that the constitutional system permits enough flexibility to transfer power within groups, but those in power resist losing it.

Panelist O'Neill said, "The time has come to educate a minority group so it can speak and exert intelligent power. The capacity to perform at a sophisticated level is what is needed." Cleveland noted that frequently the friends of the poor are the ones who become leaders rather than the poor themselves.

Many participants urged that the schools make use of the resources of the poor. Cleveland said that in the rush of filing applications for the first year of Title I money, the poor were not consulted about the projects. While this is understandable, he said, "we're continuing the same programs next year."

Panelist Banks said, "It is not difficult to involve the poor—if they can see how the involvement will help them." They will not learn this as long as the school system is isolated from the community, he said. "There is a basic intelligence among people that we ought to tap."

Grant Venn, Associate Commissioner for Adult and Vocational Education, said the schools must devise some means to make education more palatable to the children of the poor. "We must find a way to report success to their families instead of failures," he said. Not only do the schools report failures on report cards every few weeks but "they also make the parents sign them as true." He added, "We're not going to reach anybody if we tell them they're no good. The schools need to involve themselves in the process of telling them they are human beings—now."

Dr. Venn continued: "Why tell them they can't go out for sports or band if they don't get good grades, when these are the only things they can do, some of them?" The time for correcting this attitude is at hand, he said, because "the anxiety of parents about what's going to happen to these youngsters is higher than it's ever been."

Consultant Sugarman noted that OEO Director R. Sargent Shriver is confident of the resources of the poor and the community to help each other. "Shriver says that 90 percent of the time when you don't get people to help, it's because you haven't asked them," he said.

"The problem resides in us, too," said panelist Dabney. "We very seldom focus on the strength of the people. We need an attitude or approach in which we will see their strengths. There is a residue of involvement in the community. Everyone wants to help the schools."

Participants also expressed worry over whether they understand the disadvantaged. Ambos said, "We need more demonstrative evidence of what makes up the disadvantaged child." Throughout the sessions Banks suggested that the group is unprepared to talk about mobilizing resources to help the disadvantaged until it is certain it knows who the disadvantaged are.

Banks also took issue with the role of the schools in providing the wide range of social services now undertaken through the new Federal programs. He said he was concerned that the school, with an essential mission of education, will so encumber itself that it will become "jack-of-all-trades and master of none." He contended that the problem of social work is one for the community as a whole instead of for the school, and that it is the community that has failed. "The emphasis should be on improving educational content rather than social services," he said. "We need to concentrate on kids who don't go to college."

Mrs. Dabney and others disagreed. "You can't separate the two—education and social services," she said. "The schools should be social-work agencies." While they should avoid the rigidities characteristic of the operations of such agencies, the schools should concern themselves with an "attitude of global planning" which could integrate these services into the school program. She noted that in rural areas the schools must be social-work practitioners because of the unavailability of other resources.

O'Neill agreed that while social work "impinges on the efficiency of the school to perform its operation, it does have to be done. The problem is how it is to be coordinated." Mrs. Dabney added that these services are necessary for the child and that "no one but the school has jumped into the gap so far."

Fantini said that if the schools limit themselves to "the three R's and subject matter mastery" the result will be simply an end product rather than an educated child with the capacity to live constructively.

Venn suggested that school systems hereafter design schools which will accommodate the social welfare activities. "In the future," he said, "the schools will have to see their role not as judge and jury [sitting in judgment on the children] but as an instrument of society which assists other individuals."

Coordination of these programs with the school system's operations is a big task which must be handled well, participants agreed. And this coordination must also be accomplished within the Federal Government, they said. Some participants reported difficulty in dealing with OEO and OE and their often similar programs which can overlap if not planned properly. Close cooperation is also necessary between the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and the Department of Housing and Urban Development so that urban development and de facto segregation can be considered simultaneously when schools are at the planning stage, one participant said.

Dittrick urged "development of a coordinating concept in Washington, D.C., itself" as one remedy for "fragmentation of programs and competition for dollars" at the local level. An OE staff member said the Commissioner's office has established a liaison position which ought to help this coordination within the Federal Government's education programs.

Sugarman said that citizens advisory committees have worked and can work, and discussions by various participants indicated generally that this is so. Mrs. William J. Cooper, chairman, Committee on Volunteer Development, National Council of Jewish Women, urged school people to mobilize the resources of the volunteer woman. "She's not a do-gooder," said Mrs. Cooper, "but we think of her as a supplement to the teacher."

Similarly, Sugarman said, "even young children can be used in a limited role" to help the schools.

Venn said that citizens' committees will function with or without the sponsorship of the schools. "Does anyone here think he doesn't have a vocal citizens' committee?" he said. "Then let him visit the tavern or the bridge club." Venn said the school can receive the services of its young people in a volunteer capacity only if it indicates that it feels the services are needed.

"Why don't we make young people an asset to society?" he said. One patricipant described a Title I program in which teenagers are going into homes to help families that need help. "We're using home economics girls to help mothers put up hems," he said.

The school system must also call on the considerable resources of the college and university to help the disadvantaged, participants said.

Panel IA

Arthur Pearl asserted that generally the school and the parent engage in a "conspiracy" against the child. The parent only gets called into the school system when the child is in trouble. The neighborhood school of 30 years ago where the teacher lived in the neighborhood and the parent could easily consult with the teacher are gone, said Dr. Pearl. "Where are those teachers in East L.A.? They don't live in East L.A. Where are those teachers in Watts? They don't live in Watts."

Panelist Montez emphasized the need to go into the communities saying: "There is going to be a point in this educational system . . . that if it is going to survive, . . . we in this highly structured ivory tower . . . are going to have to get down there. We are going to have to get down to places like Watts . . . we are going to have to get a little dirty. We are going to have to be upset. . . . The only way we are going to find out how to deal with the disadvantaged . . . is in our own communities . . ."

Panel IIA

While the consensus of the discussion was in favor of the involvement of community people in the schools,

IA panelists take a "photo-break." Left to right, seated: Leander J. Shaw, Roy McCanne, Wilson C. Riles (Chairman), Arthur Pearl. Standing: Philip Montez, Harry L. Bowers, Rodney Tillman and Charles Cogen.

some warned that it was "rapidly becoming a panacea for almost every problem, but is probably raising more problems than it is solving." University students, especially those who are considering careers in teaching, should certainly not be overlooked. Through a sound program devised by both the public school system and the university, they can provide services desperately needed by the schools.

Programs of family and community involvement were noted by several participants:

- A classroom teacher from Knoxville, Tenn., reported that teachers go to the homes and involve the parents in sewing clubs, mothers' clubs, and a variety of activities that take place not only during the evening hours, but also on Saturdays and Sundays. In her school, teachers "are willing to do more." The positive climate results in educational progress for the children, the teacher said.
- At P.S. 192 in Harlem, 65 percent of whose pupils read at or above grade level, 75 percent of the parents are active in the PTA.
- Several participants mentioned involvement of local business and industry. It can help overcome some of the severe personnel problems facing local schools; help provide youngsters with saleable skills; and in work-study programs, it can be a source of part-time jobs.
- A Beloit, Wis., district administrator related the successful experiences of his system since they turned to private enterprise and industry 4 years ago. Industry and curriculum planners developed a program of study that lasts 12 months. Industry pays the students' salaries, and at the same time students are learning skills.

Research and Evaluation

Panel IIIA

Panelist Passow was particularly emphatic about the need for more effective help in evaluation techniques. "Title I is the first Federal law with built-in evaluation," he said. "The schools need assistance in evaluating their title I proposals. We're trying new ideas, but we are using old, inapplicable evaluating techniques."

This point was referred to again and again during the meetings. There is no way to measure self-concept in a 4-year-old, for instance, although the building of self-concept is one of the archstones in Head Start projects. There is no way to measure the value of field trips for preliterates or other students unable to take paper-and-pencil tests.

The questions Dr. Passow raised about the need for research were answered different ways in different contexts throughout the meetings. Opinion ranged from believing that present research is adequate but not being used, to the belief that very little is known about even the most basic elements of education. If research does exist, the group would like to see it put into usable form and widely disseminated.

Dr. Martin made the final panel presentation. "We are in considerable danger," he said, "that Head Start and other preschool programs that appear to be so successful mask the fact that we know next to nothing about early education." He called for longitudinal research on the consequences of early education.

There was unanimous agreement on the need for continued research. As one observer put it, "If we don't go on with research, in 1976 we'll still be fighting the war on poverty with the tactics of 1962."

Panel IIB

Dr. Zigler said that in his long experience with Operation Head Start, "I found not only reluctance but downright apathy to research. Too many educators treat the researcher as an enemy, not as someone to work with in seeing how we can all best serve children. We all want the best for these kids, but we aren't going to find it unless we keep looking. Now we have a kind of numbers game—how many kids and how much money—but no real evaluation. That's because it is easier to count kids and dollars than to evaluate motivation and morale."

Section II. SPECIAL PROGRAMS

Title I and School Desegregation

Chairman: James E. Mauch, Chief, Programs Branch, Division of Compensatory Education, U.S. Office of Education

We are her to discuss ways in which Title I projects can contribute to solving problems of school segregation. We all know that this can be done, and is being done in some localities. We also know that funds can be used to preserve the status quo. Any such discussion must look back to the school desegregation decisions of the U.S. Supreme Court in 1954 and 1955. In those decisions, the Court ruled that racially separate educational facilities are inherently unequal, and therefore unconstitutional.

As part of the Supreme Court's decisions, lower courts were directed to require school districts to make a prompt and reasonable start toward desegregating the schools. In discharging that responsibility, the courts have in many cases felt it necessary to define what desegregation really means. Thus, a recent court opinion stated: "It is not enough to open the previously all-white school to Negro students who desire to go there, while all-Negro schools continue to be maintained as such."

In short, school authorities have been told by the courts that they may not remain passive, that, on the contrary, they must take definite affirmative action to eliminate the dual school system. But, although the dual system is no longer legal, it all too often exists in fact in every part of the Nation, and so does the racial discrimination prohibited by law.

The position of the Office of Education in this situation is, I think, clear. In case it is not, I quote from Commissioner Howe's speech to the Urban League earlier this year:

> Considering the authority that we gentlemanly education officials have at our command to correct racial injustice in our schools I feel we have accomplished very little so far. While we have gone on urging moderation, sweet reason, and bigger and better panel discussions, of which this is one, the schools throughout the Nation remain almost as segregated as they were in 1954.

The Commissioner further stated:

> Our task obviously requires an activity more sophisticated than the gritting of our corporate teeth. School officials occupy a curious position somewhere between that of the educational leader and the political leader, but it is apparent that for many areas a necessary sensitivity to public opinion has tended to dilute their sense of responsibility for educational leadership and that they have exercised it only after the public parade has already decided which way it wants to go.

The men on this panel have chosen the substance of educational leadership rather than the shadow. They have been working on the issue of desegregation for some time, each in his own public and, I suspect, in his own private capacity. Whether or not they have met the success they hoped for, only they can say. But anyone who is familiar with them would, I believe, say that they have toiled long and hard in the vineyard.

I would ask them now to tell you about their efforts, why their efforts are important to our goals, and what these efforts have to do with the aims and use of Title I funds.

Wilson C. Riles, director of compensatory education, California State Department of Education

I would like to state at the outset that we in California do not think that we have solved the problem of eliminating de facto school segregation. We think we have made a start.

When Title I funds became available, we were faced with a program that might have been at variance with our State policy and laws. Back in 1962, the State Board of Education took a position on de facto segregation in the schools of California which became part of California law. The following is an excerpt from the Board's resolution:

> It is the declared policy of the State Board of Education that persons or agencies responsible for the establishment of school attendance centers or the assignment of pupils thereto shall exert all effort to avoid and eliminate segregation of children on account of race or color.

The California Supreme Court backed up the State Board's policy in its decision in *Jackson v. Pasadena School District.* I will read one paragraph from its ruling in that case:

> So long as large numbers of Negroes live in segregated areas, school authorities will be confronted with difficult problems in

> providing Negro children with the kind of education they are entitled to have. Residential segregation is in itself an evil which tends to frustrate the youth in the area and to cause antisocial attitudes and behavior. Where such segregation exists it is not enough for a school board to refrain from affirmative discriminatory conduct. The harmful influence on the children will be reflected and intensified in the classroom if school attendance is determined on a geographic basis without corrective measures. The right to an equal opportunity for education and the harmful consequences of segregation require that school boards take steps, insofar as reasonably feasible, to alleviate racial imbalance in schools regardless of its cause.

That is the position and the policy of the State of California, as evidence by the Board resolution and the court ruling.

Title I, as you know, speaks of concentrations of disadvantaged youngsters, and some of us were much concerned that it would put us in a position of reinforcing segregation patterns. (And, by the way, there are people in California, as I suspect there are elsewhere, who would be perfectly willing to give you compensatory education if you kept the children in the ghettos.) For a year, our Advisory Committee on Compensatory Education has been wrestling with this problem regarding Title I.

In addition to the State Board's policy and the court's decision, which I have already quoted, we have in California the McAteer Act of 1965. This governs all compensatory education activities and therefore all programs for disadvantaged children, since in California all such programs are administered under the Division of Compensatory Education. Let me read you one key section in this State law:

> Nothing in this chapter shall be construed to sanction, perpetuate or promote the racial or ethnic segregation of pupils in the public schools.

Our first confrontation with the problem with regard to Title I of ESEA came by way of a school district whose administrator said, as we were informed: "Now I am going to put Wilson Riles and the Department of Education and the U.S. Office of Education on the spot. I am going to ask for Title I funds for buses to integrate 250 youngsters in my district, and I am going to see what they will do about that."

We welcomed this challenge, and let it be known that we would certainly have to review such an application. But first we went into the question of how to deal with the problem of disadvantaged youngsters where there are no concentrations of poverty—in other words, how to deal with scattered poverty. We worked out a system whereby we would review a project on the basis of how it defined where the disadvantaged youngsters were, the problems they had, and the process the school had gone through to define the problem and arrive at ways of dealing with it.

If a district decided to completely integrate its schools and scatter its poverty, we thought we could deal with this on the basis of the intent of the act. In the case of the busing project just mentioned, we simply said that if the district wished to really integrate and set up a situation where it would have scattered poverty, we would be willing to work out something with it. But, if it was just going to come up with a token plan to move 250 youngsters, we would raise some serious questions. In the end, a project was worked out which also relieved overcrowding and added personnel, special instructional equipment and materials, teacher inservice training, and curriculum development.

Now, finally, as for the action we took on the overall problem. On June 9 the State Board of Education adopted its present position with regard to Title I projects. The State law provides, as we have seen, that programs should not sanction, perpetuate, or promote racial or ethnic segregation of pupils in the public schools. In our guidelines for Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, we prescribe certain actions to comply with California State policy with regard to the integration of pupils in the public schools and to provide the maximum educational benefits to the children being served.

In its application for funds for a project under Title I, we say the applying district shall include a statement as to the effect, if any, that the proposed project will have on patterns of segregation in its schools. It must explain the extent to which it has addressed itself to the problem of de facto segregation and what actions it proposes to alleviate this problem. The crucial test is whether the project sanctions or perpetuates segregation.

We suggest a few examples. Some of these have been tried; others have not. In a newly integrated school district, funds under Public Law 89-10 may be used to facilitate preparations for the integration process, provided these funds focus on educationally deprived children residing in the target area. After the integration process is operative, programs of compensatory education using Title I funds may follow, to help enhance the children's educational attainment and adjustment to the new situation.

Funds may also be used for the purchase of intergroup relations materials. Let me preface that remark by saying this: We have somewhat structured what the State feels about desegregation, but we know that the local district must first identify what they consider the problem to be.

Again, if a district says—and we are encouraging districts to say this—that one of the pressing needs, or the most pressing need, to which a project is addressed is the elimination of isolation and separation, we feel that this falls completely within Title I.

Let me add just two more examples: School districts which recognize that in the education of deprived children motivation for achievement may be increased by racial integration, can develop a plan for using the funds to assist deprived pupils who will be involved in an integrated situation. And in school situations where classroom space is available, Title I funds may be used to develop a program whereby children would be transported from a target school and placed elsewhere in the district. This procedure should not only facilitate racial integration but also reduce the class size in the target school.

We also feel very strongly that under the State's responsibility to judge the size, scope, and quality of a project, we must help school districts to use Title I funds properly.

With regard to construction: We have received a number of projects that contained a component for reducing class size, and had to make a judgment as to whether we would permit building permanent structures in ghettos. In the $74 million we have allocated we have not approved one permanent construction component. We have taken the position that the youngsters need help now, and not 2 or 3 years from now, after a building has been constructed.

Thomas F. Pettigrew, associate professor of social psychology, Harvard University

I think we can all agree that Title I establishes a great precedent for public education in the United States.

But Title I also has one great danger. If, through its special programs, it acts to separate the poor and the disadvantaged from other children in the public schools, it may prove self-defeating. I am not talking merely about racial segregation now, but about the separation of disadvantaged children in general from advantaged children.

In the recent study which the Office of Education completed under title IV of the Civil Rights Act, one of the chief findings is that the aptitude and achievement scores of disadvantaged children are more related to the characteristics of the children with whom they go to school than to other school variables. That is, it is important for the education and the achievement scores of disadvantaged children that these children be in schools with advantaged children. If Title I funds should be used, directly or inadvertently, to separate the disadvantaged from the advantaged, we would be losing what the survey has shown, on the basis of very clear data, to be the most important means of raising the achievement of disadvantaged children.

Frankly, this danger in Title I concerns me a great deal. And, to be blunt, most of the examples that we were given as we came in of Title I projects involving desegregation do not greatly reassure me. But two of them are, I think, reassuring—and it is about these that I will talk here.

Many projects are really hashed-over examples of measures that have failed in the past, that is, special arrangements for the disadvantaged treated separately from others. The past record of education is literally crammed with the failures of such programs.

But two programs among the samples we were given do reassure me, particularly because they have long-range potentials. These are the East Orange, N.J., program for an educational plaza and the Hartford plan for regional desegregation [see exhibits A and B]. It seems to me that these two commendable programs, taken together, contain the ingredients and show the direction for long-term solutions to the problems, solutions that must and, we hope, can be supported with Title I funds.

The idea of an educational park for the entire school system is one ingredient that we will need. The other idea, contained in the Hartford plan, adds the suburban dimension.

It is hardly a secret that in Washington, Philadelphia, Chicago, Cleveland, and other cities, we are simply running out of white children to desegregate in the inner city. We are not running out of whites in the United States, however. Whites are also coming to the metropolitan areas, just as Negroes are. But, before there can be any ultimate solutions to the desegregation of the public schools in our inner cities, we must involve the suburbs. These have been well called the white noose that surrounds the Negro neck; they will have to become something more positive in educational terms than they are now.

I would hope that Title I would be the source of funds for such a program as the Hartford plan, and that it and other similar plans (for example, METCO in the Boston area) might serve as experimental pilot models for us to watch, particularly with a view to combining such plans with the educational park idea.

I accept the point just made by the gentleman from California that we have to do something immediately. But let us not fix our exclusive attention on short-run solutions that will institutionalize problems for the future. We should also be thinking of long-run solutions—of, for example, ringing our large cities with educational parks in which half or more of the student bodies would be drawn from the suburbs.

I urge this not just for reasons of desegregation but for many other educational reasons as well. This would, I think, really meet what the Congress had in mind in Title I—the raising of the achievement levels of disadvantaged American youth. If, on the contrary, the danger in Title I that I mentioned above comes about, if we separate the advantaged from the disadvantaged, I am afraid that Title I will go down as an unfortunate precedent for American education.

Alexander J. Plante, Title I coordinator and executive director, Office of Program Development, Connecticut State Department of Education.

I agree with Dr. Pettigrew that maybe in the long-run planning we can develop quality education in the city. But for the immediate solution and for the generation we are dealing with, we must have the cooperation of all people and not just manifest our hatred and our disgust of the city and take the attitude: "You are responsible; we are not. Therefore, you live with your problem." In the Hartford plan [see exhibit B] we are saying that immediate solutions to the problem we are facing and discussing here today cannot be found in the city alone.

The point of view that the plan embodies is based on two university studies. The first was a study, by the University of Connecticut, of 4-year-old Negro children in low-cost housing in the city of Hartford. When the researchers compared the so-called native intelligence of these youngsters with their linguistic ability, they found that these 4-year-olds were very intelligent but that, as they prepared to enter the mainstream of society, they would be increasingly handicapped by their limited linguistic ability.

The second was a study made in Hartford by Harvard University. This study found that 52 percent of the elementary-school children in the city of Hartford were nonwhite, that this number was rising at the rate of 5 percent a year, and that, if no countermeasures were taken, Hartford would in time become essentially an all-Negro ghetto, and any attempts to to find solutions in the city would therefore be self-defeating. The study concluded that the solution cannot be found within the city; there must be cooperation with the suburbs.

In addition to this, we listened to the people. Anyone who has listened to the group of people we are talking about quickly gets a sense of their isolation from the mainstream of society. To such remarks as, "Aren't things better? Jobs are available; society is more affluent," they would reply, "No, things are getting worse. At one time there were many poor people with all kinds of aspirations. But now you in the North, because of the pigmentation of our skin, keep us isolated from the mainstream of society by the subtle organizational ways in which you operate."

So we felt a bold intervention was necessary. Let me now briefly tell you what our plan consists of. Moving on a pilot basis, we will arrange for 300 youngsters from 1 through 5 to be accepted into schools in 5 suburban towns.

Eight schools in Hartford have an attendance of more than 85 percent nonwhite; seven of these schools go to 95 percent or more nonwhite. From these 8 schools we selected the 300 children from 2 kindergartens and 2 first, second, third, fourth, and fifth grades. We used a random basis of selection so as to get a cross-section of the entire nonwhite community.

We asked 4 suburban communities just to let us use their vacant seats: for example, if they had 23 children in a class and could accommodate 25, to let us put 2 in there; or if they had 20 children and could accommodate 24, to let us put in 4. We were looking for places for 75 youngsters in 4 communities. One community (Glastonbury) turned us down, but two other communities came to the fore and said they would participate. So we now have five communities participating with us to some degree.

We learned from the University of Connecticut study that deprivation starts early; that you cannot just pick out a group of these youngsters and leave it at that; that you must make sure that the deprivation already caused is quickly ameliorated, and that the education of these children proceeds rapidly. Therefore under the Hartford plan, with every 25 youngsters we will send a supportive team consisting of a teacher from the city of Hartford and educational aides who will work with these youngsters and other youngsters in the receiving community with similar types of disabilities.

We are looking very hard for answers, and I think we will get some from our strong research component. As this plan proceeds, we will observe the educational achievement of the white youngsters as compared with that of the nonwhite youngsters—and of the youngsters who remain in the ghetto compared with that of those who travel to the suburban towns. We will also observe and seek for the kinds of things we can do to train people for desegregation programs, not just in Hartford but in other places—New Haven, Bridgeport, Waterbury, and throughout the State of Connecticut. Requests have already come in from other Connecticut communities for a similar kind of program.

What are our problems? I think you must know them, and I think we must face them and understand them.

The subtle prejudices of the North, to me, are much more devastating than the open prejudices of the South. Make no mistake about it; we live in the same box. We've had meetings of 200 to 300 persons where we would have to have 15 policemen to guard us from physical harm. It was an experience I never thought would happen. So let's not feel proud of what we are or look askance at others; let's look to our own situation here, for, believe me, we have a long way to go.

There also seems to have developed in this country the widespread belief that the suburban community has no relevance to the inner city. It is amazing to me how we can go into that city each day, earn our living, use the hospitals, use the cultural activities, use the sewage systems, and say, "The heck with you!" It just isn't possible, because disease in the city will bring disease to the suburbs, and we will all perish from it. Make no mistake about it. Running throughout the United States is a suburban isolation from the city which needs to be broken down.

It seems to us that we must secure the necessary financial support for the kinds of things we are trying in Hartford. I certainly hope the U.S. Congress will make it possible financially to move this kind of program forward.

It seems to us, also, that we must go to our State legislatures immediately, to establish the legal basis for such programs. We expect to be in court a lot next year. I think we will win every time. But the statute should be clear and should provide for and encourage school desegration.

I also want you to know there are carefully organized groups that will operate in your community and will distort everything you say. In other words, they will say that housing must come first; or that adopting Negro orphans will be the solution to everything; and so forth. This is only feinting. Or they will call your plan metropolitan, devastating, federalistic, socialistic, communistic, or any other bad word they can dream up. They are well organized. This sort of stuff will be broadcast in your communities just as fast as the mimeograph machines can turn it out. You have got to be aware of this.

One other point which is extremely important for anyone undertaking a program of this kind. We picked the most affluent communities in the Hartford region and the communities where the educational level was the highest. The lower social classes feel threatened by the Negro. So, if you are going to make your move, make it where you can be successful.

We hope to have some results for you in 2 years. We feel almost overwhelmed by the potential for success here. As I look at these youngsters and the response from the Negro community, I think we are all going to have a great deal of satisfaction from the Hartford plan.

John Henry Martin, superintendent, Mount Vernon Public Schools, Mount Vernon, New York

I make the following statement in PTA's, Lions Clubs, and similar important agencies of our community life: "The time has come to say openly that the all-Negro school, or the nearly all-Negro school, in the American city is an educational curse. The evidence is in. It is indefensible as a continued institution. The question is, what do you do about it?" I would hope that the school superintendents of America would individually and collectively make a similar flat statement.

The U.S. Commissioner of Education made such a statement, and made it eloquently. But the question is not what he has said, but what he does about it. And the same question confronts the cities and the small towns of America.

The answers are relatively easy in suburban areas where there may be, say, five all-white schools and one Negro ghetto school in a school district. Here the solution is relatively simple and has been achieved in many places, though not without turmoil, courage, and a great deal of difficulty. It is to close the ghetto school down, roll the buses in, take the children out, and distribute them among the other schools of the town. Some of us have done that.

But that answer is not applicable in densely populated urban areas such as Mount Vernon, which has a population of 20,000. There, more than 50 percent of the elementary school pupils are Negro. Closing down 5 or 6 of the 11 schools won't do the job. The civil rights leadership has an answer: Use the same fleet of buses to take half of the Negro pupils out of these schools and to bring half of the whites in from the northern half of the city. That is a variant of the Princeton plan, with its instant desegregation. The difficulty with this solution is that the board of education won't adopt it—and, at this point, no one is in a position to compel them to adopt it.

Between those two answers lie others. There is, for example, the 4-4-4 plan. This plan I rejected as an answer for our community on the grounds that while it effected a kind of solution for the middle school and the high school, it gave up on the solution for the first 4 elementary years and allowed a permanent segregated pattern during these 4 years of education.

Yet another answer is the educational park. In terms of its impact as a desegregation device, I have no argument against this answer, other than the fact that it is years and years of bond issues and construction away.

But there is a second basis for criticism of the educational park. This is the fact that the plan contains within itself no ingredient for educational reform or improvement. If you rebundle on one site thousands of children from a larger geographic area but do not envisage a reform and reorganization of the structure of education, once they are on that site, you may have the answer to the question of desegregation; but your answer has nothing to do with the reform of education as such.

This criticism is not antagonistic to the desegregation intent of the plan. All I am saying is that the educational heart of the program has yet to be evolved. I think I have a partial answer in the academy concept [see exhibit C] and I would marry both, one to the other.

The plan we in Mount Vernon came up with, in the idea of the academy as an interim measure, was based on the recognition of the importance of time in terms of months, not years. The establishment and operation of the academy would call for the purchase of a sizable piece of property and the utilization of buildings already there. On this site would be evolved and conducted a program for the academic review, the supervision, and the tutorial instruction of children from every elementary school in the city. These children would come to the academy every day for 2 hours of intensive remedial, advance, corrective, clinical work on an individual basis which had been diagnostically established.

That is the academic center of the plan. It would mean that within a period of 10 or 12 months initial steps could be taken with the first several hundred children. The operation could be programmatically increased in 30-day cycles, and we should expect that in about 18 months we would be in full swing, with 2,000 of the 6,000 children in the K to 5 program at the academy for each working day they were in school.

But there is a growing hostility within the community to the accomplishment of this plan. The board voted it. The commissioner of the State of New York approved it. Civil rights groups opposed it. At one time we had the distinction of having just about as remarkable a consensus as President Johnson might have dreamed of, all opposed to the plan.

To me, the plan appears to offer a functional structural reform in the nature of elementary education, a byproduct of which would be high-speed integration of the elementary schools.

Title III would provide the planning and operational funds. Title I would provide the transportation funds. We have such money set aside for the beginning operation this coming year.

John H. Fischer, president, Teachers College, Columbia University

It seems to me that if we are to have the kind of comprehensive approach to the problem we are talking about here this afternoon, it is important to prepare first what the strategist calls an estimate of the situation. As we look at the situation we have to deal with, it would be well to take into account the facts that can't be talked away. One way or another, we will have to deal with them.

First, we have to face the fact that we are dealing here with a form of social inertia which is particularly baffling. This is not to say it cannot be changed. But to act as though we were not confronting this social analogue of Newton's first law of motion seems to me unrealistic to the point of irresponsibility.

Second, we need to face the fact that we are dealing, in this inertial condition, with apprehension, unfamiliarity, and insecurity—if you will, with fear. We lump these together and call them prejudice. But it isn't as simple or as easy as that. We have to face the components of this prejudice if we are to deal with it. If we don't deal with it, I am afraid whatever plans we lay are likely to come to grief.

In the third place, we are dealing with the hard fact of the ghetto. None of us here like ghettos. But we have them and we won't wish them away overnight. We will have to lay plans to deal with them. Unless they are taken into account in our planning, our planning again is not likely to be very effective.

In the fourth place, we are dealing with shifting residential patterns. We have not only the problem of the ghetto and the problem of desegregating our cities; we have, also, the problem of preventing resegregation. One of our saddest experiences these days is when we find ourselves, after we have taken brave, bold steps to desegregate schools, face to face with the fact that housing resegregation is bringing the water back as fast as we can pump it out.

Again, we are dealing, as Tom Pettigrew has reminded us, with the white suburban influence. Sometimes this means also with a series of tripwires. There are all kinds of hazards here. Whatever words, whatever figures, we use, the fact is that we do have this ring of white homogeneous, unresisting opposition to the integration of our population.

Monsignor James C. Donohue of the National Catholic Welfare Conference; Dr. John H. Fischer, Columbia University; Commissioner Howe; and Austin Haddock of the Oregon State Department of Education, converse during the Conference.

In addition, we have a great many small, independent, and relatively homogeneous school systems. They are not only homogeneously white. Increasingly, we are getting school systems that are homogeneously Negro. I don't know which is worse, an all-white or an all-Negro school system. Neither says much about an open society. Until we find a way to come to grips with this problem, we are going to have shortages in our plans.

Furthermore, we have the problem of the segregating effect of nonpublic schools. I doubt that anybody in this room would want to remove from the American system the option parents now have of choosing independent schools for their children. But when you look at New York City and other cities, the fact of the matter is that the option of parents to choose nonpublic schools for their children means in many cases the option to choose a segregated white school. Of course, most of these schools now have their token enrollment. They have their demonstration Negro children placed in the places of high visibility, like the receptionists in corporate offices on Madison Avenue. But we are still dealing with a difficult situation that must be taken into account.

Over and above this, we have the fact of wide overlap in this country between minority racial status and economic poverty. Tom Pettigrew was getting at this point earlier, when he spoke of the hazard in Title I of segregating children in terms of poverty, only to discover that we have at the same time segregated them in terms of race.

Lastly, we have another fact which we don't talk about as much as we should, although schoolmen are coming to talk about it more and more often these days. This is the fact and tradition of the political isolation of our public schools in this country. There was a time when it seemed awfully smart and absolutely necessary to separate the schools from partisan and often corrupt political arrangements, particularly in our large cities. But we have now separated them for something like 50 or 75 years, to the extent that they have become in many cases almost hermetically sealed, administratively and politically, from the ordinary decision-making and policy-forming practices of municipal and State government.

So, as we plan our strategies, we had better remember that they have to be something more than exhibitions of opportunistic ingenuity. As we select Title I projects to deal with the difficulties of segregation and to move toward desegregation and integration, we should choose our projects and plan them so that they will not only deal with the specific problems of culturally and educationally disadvantaged children but also attack the broad problems that I have been trying to sketch out. We can't rely on the simply opportunistic approach.

I think Henry Adams once called simplicity one of the most deceitful mysteries that ever betrayed mankind, and I suspect that we have a problem here in guarding against allowing the single target approach of Title I to confuse us into thinking that, if we hit that target, everything else will be taken care of.

We need, of course, to concentrate on the target. But we don't want to develop tunnel vision at the time we are keeping our eye on that one target. This won't be easy. It means, for one thing, that as we set up our Title I projects we shall need to make deliberate efforts to involve children of both races in every possible case. This doesn't mean that we would necessarily reject a project just because it happens to meet the needs of children of one race at the moment. But it does mean that wherever possible we will want to involve the children as well as the parents and teachers of more than one race.

Second, we will need to work on the periphery of our ghettos as well as in the heart of the ghettos. It may be that in some instances we shall not be able to desegregate schools in the depth of the worst of the ghettos. As it appears to me now, about the only way to do that is to ask all of the Negro children to move, at their expense of trouble and time and effort, to the places where the white children already are. Somehow, that strikes me as offensive. This is not to say that a bus is never a handy or useful instrument. There are, of course, times when it is good. But to rely on it as the sole means of dealing with the problem of the ghetto seems to me unjust and inequitable and in the final analysis unrealistic. But every one of our ghettos has a periphery, and the larger this gets, the more opportunities it presents.

Another thing we will need to do is set up joint projects involving groups of schools and groups of school districts. You have already heard allusions to that kind of activity this afternoon, and many of you are involved in it. This is one of the ways of drawing a larger circle to include the smaller circles which we are trying to serve and ultimately to eliminate.

We are going to have to find ways to bring together the new arrivals and the old arrivals in communities. We will have to find ways to ease the problems of transition as people move in and out of our neighborhoods. Another way of putting it is to say that we will try to make a virtue rather than an obstacle of the mobility of our population.

We are going to have to make particular effort to bring together city and suburban children. You have heard references to that this afternoon. But it won't be easy. Here in Washington, the only way to bring together the city and suburbs is to bring together two sovereign States and the Federal Government. There are easier problems to deal with, I am told. Maybe this is where we need a State and Federal Government compact.

Another thing we need to pay attention to are cooperative projects that will pool the resources of small districts and so bring their people together. We have had entirely too much compartmentalization of our educational government in the name of local independence. We had better recognize that localism in itself is not necessarily a virtue. It has virtues within it, but let's not confuse the virtues with the vices.

We might very well move to demonstration projects under State or intermediate district leadership that would transcend the difficulties and in some cases the obstinacy of local school units. I would like to think of this as a display of leadership rather than a display of coercion; and I think the leadership might win out in the long run. But the run had better not be too long, or we will be dealing with another generation of children.

We need joint activities to bring together on deliberate, carefully arranged bases the children, parents, and teachers of public and nonpublic schools. We can't get into all kinds of arguments about the problems of church and state, the independence of independent schools, and all of that kind of thing. But here again we had better recognize that there is a broader circle to which all of the smaller circles relate, and I think part of it is a matter of drawing the broader circle that will take in the smaller ones, respecting their integrity but not insisting on their isolation.

In addition, we ought to find ways to integrate across socioeconomic as well as racial lines. If we think of integration solely as a racial problem, we are likely to come to grief. It is more than a racial problem; it involves cultural differences, economic differences, many kinds of ethnic differences. But it is race that has made the biggest single difference for us in America, and therefore we had better not lose sight of race as we talk about the broader picture.

In all of this I keep thinking of a line in the *Brown* [v. *Board of Education*, 347 U.S. 483] decision that might give us a clue. Indeed, I think this clue is going to give many of our courts and our States clues as we move on into another level of attack on the problem of de facto segregation. This line says that the opportunity to receive an education—and here I think I can quote the exact words—"where the State has undertaken to provide it, is a right that must be made available to all on equal terms."

We are going to have to come back to the problem Tom Pettigrew stated in his comments on Title I: How we are going to take care of the special problems of the disadvantaged child while at the same time we undertake to provide truly equalized educational opportunities for all our children? This is not easy. But I don't think we dare put the problem on any lower plane.

EXHIBIT A

EAST ORANGE, N.J.

Educational Plaza

East Orange proposes to build its entire school system on one central school site, in a series of stages, starting with a middle school for grades 5 through 8. While the school will be administratively and physically concentrated, the plan calls for a major reformulation of the role of the school in an urban community in what might be characterized as a "swing" city. They are hoping to invert and expand the usual school-community concept, believing that the community itself and all of its resources should become the school.

The idea of an entire citywide school system on one central site is itself unique. It presents opportunities of curriculum development, personnel deployment, and the commitment of community resources, all in a variety of new patterns of interrelationships. Since there will be only one school site, total integration will be achieved.

Planning is viewed in terms of both substantive needs and process goals. Community participation, involvement, and commitment are viewed as essential to the success of the program and will be an integral part of the planning process. A distinguished advisory group has been assembled for overall policy and program development advice, and a range of technical consultants will be sought on specific project needs.

Planning funds were requested under Title III, ESEA.

EXHIBIT B

HARTFORD. CONN.

Regional Desegregating Plan

The Connecticut State Department of Education, in cooperation with the Connecticut OEO, the cities of Hartford and West Hartford, the towns of Farmington, Manchester, South Windsor, and Simsbury will initiate, plan, and implement a regional desegregation program for elementary school children. Specifically, the ojectives of this project are to—

Develop a cooperative structure between an inner city and suburban communities to help solve the educational problems related to racial desegregation

Secure, analyze, and interpret data on attitudes of white and nonwhite children, parents, educators, and other appropriate persons where nonwhite children are transported from inner cities to suburban schools

Secure, analyze, and interpret data on the educational achievement of white and nonwhite children participating in regional desegregation plan

Establish and evaluate the extracurricular and social activities in which nonwhite children from inner city schools can participate when transported to suburban schools

Orientate Connecticut communities toward regional solutions for educational problems related to racial desegregation

Train professional and nonprofessional personnel for effective operation of desegregation programs

Determine effective educational designs for communities involved in this type of desegregation plan.

The proposed program involves the random selection of approximately 300 children in grades kindergarten through 5, from schools of the city of Hartford with more than 85 percent nonwhite enrollment. During the second year of the project, these children will be enrolled in grades 1 through 6. With each 25 children identified for transporting, a professional teacher and a nonprofessional aide will be assigned as a supportive team. In addition, a social worker will be assigned for each 100 children to provide community services. A university team will evaluate findings secured from the project.

EXHIBIT C

MOUNT VERNON, N.Y.

The Children's Academy

A new concept in school organization is being planned, involving Federal, State, and local partnership for integration and educational reform.

The tripartite plan is based on excellence in education, equality of opportunity, and survival of the urban center.

An addition to the present high school will be built to conduct all 4 years of high school on one site. This means 100 percent integration on the high school level for 3,800 students and makes possible rigorous business and industrial training and an elite college preparatory school.

Housing of the seventh and eighth grades in one complex (possibly sixth grade) eliminates 4 racially imbalanced junior high schools and achieves 100 percent integration for 1,800 children of seventh and eighth grades.

A new complex is envisaged including the following centers:

- Center for academic control, supervision, and pupil auditing
- Educational and medical clinic center
- Center for the performing and creative arts
- Children's library center
- *Farm* for city children
- Center for teacher training

Approximate total cost: $5 million.

Title I and the Performing Arts: Some Possible Approaches

Chairman: Katheryn Bloom, Director, Arts and Humanities Program, Office of Education

In this special demonstration session, Miss Bloom introduced three groups of artists and arts administrators who have had extensive experience with performing arts programs in schools enrolling large numbers of culturally handicapped children.

Although demonstration formed an important part of the program, particularly in the case of the section on the dance, the explanatory remarks by the performers contained descriptions of their work in the schools. Excerpts from their comments, in a slightly edited form, appear below. The performers who gave these demonstrations have indicated their willingness to provide further information and/or materials about their experiences, on request.

I. Dance

Pearl Primus,[1] the Primus-Borde Dance Studio, 17 West 24th Street, New York, N.Y. 10010

I understand that educators have reached the point where they realize that the word—spoken or written—is not enough to reach the whole being. We are talking here especially about the deprived child. To me, the deprived child is one who has been socially and economically cut off from the visible and obvious benefits that can contribute to his personal growth. What has he done? He has taken the intangible essence which cannot be controlled by society and put it into his own world—and he has closed the doors. In many instances we cannot reach him with the obvious, with the visible and tangible. But through the arts, man's oldest and strongest means of communication, we can reach into the inner being of all children and all adults.

Dance, like all arts, deals with an inner and invisible substance or essence which we cannot quite put our fingers on but must allow to speak for itself. Since earliest times, dance has been used to teach the young the values in their society and to pass on values from generation to generation, even where there was no written word. The dance, sculpture, music, poetry, drama, painting—all of these have something today that has a value for society. And the child who is deprived has lived with dance and music—which often he has created for himself. *Through* dance and music and other forms of art, we can *reach* that child.

As an example, this afternoon, I am going to demonstrate one of the most interesting and effective ways of subtly getting across what is right and what is wrong in a community. I believe that children, like all people, are essentially alike all over the world. Children especially are alike. When it is time to go to bed, they don't want to. And mothers are alike all over the world because they don't care for this—when it is time for the children to go to bed, they insist upon it.

When the child stalls, he says, "Mommy, may I have a drink of water please?" or "Mommy, may I watch TV, please?" or "Hey Mom, will you read a story to me, please?" All over the world, it's the same thing. The child will stall before going to bed. And so this has become the magic hour—the hour for story telling. In Africa, when a mother rises to tell a story, often through the dance, the story she tells has to do with certain things, either desirable or undesirable, in the society, in the culture.

Now, as educators, we know that the legend, the story, is a powerful vehicle for transmitting values. And now we are going to see a story told in a way that gets these values across to the children without them even knowing it. The story that will be told in my dance today is "How Mr. Spider Got Such a Small Waistline." Now, Mr. Spider, in west and central Africa, is a trickster; he is the vehicle for parents and teachers to portray those qualities which are not desirable in society. And, when you say to a child, "You're like Mr. Spider," it is indeed a terrible, terrible thing.

Whether you like the story or not, notice the technique of telling it. For it *reaches* the child—not only in Africa, not only in South America, not only among American Indians, not only among the people of Australia and the continent of Europe, but right here in our own big cities. For a story, told or danced, reaches

---

[1] Miss Primus, the American ethnic dancer, has just completed an Office of Education research project utilizing African dance to help elementary school children understand other cultures and peoples. Last year, as part of the project, the Primus-Borde troupe gave dance and storytelling presentations in more than 25 Harlem elementary schools.

Miss Primus tells a "bedtime story" through the dance.

the child in ways that few other educational devices can.

II. Theater

Marcelle Felser,[3] The Vanguard Theater, Vanguard Projects Division, Pittsburgh Playhouse, 222 Craft Avenue, Pittsburgh, Pa. 15213

There is no mystery in the fact that Miss Primus has just been talking to you about "reaching," and that I have come up here to talk to you about "reaching." Because we are all in the same business of trying to give an understanding of the contribution that the artist—the creative person—can make to the education of the human being. We in the Vanguard Theater believe strongly that classic theater, theater of content, has an enormous contribution to make to education.

To bring theater into the schools is no revolutionary idea. In many places in this country theater is already being brought into the schools, occasionally and in small amounts. We were not content with that. We said that the theater belongs in the schools as a co-curricular activity—not as an extraordinary, esoteric, and invited guest who can be brought to the table at 3:30 in the afternoon and kept very separate from everything else there was to learn. We asked that we might bring carefully designed theater into the high school auditorium to support the curriculum because the high school student has been *studying* theater as though it were a book, a record, or a film. The theater is none of these.

---

[3] As producer-director of the Vanguard Projects Division of the Pittsburgh Playhouse, Mrs. Felser has brought live theater to high school and college students in the Pittsburgh area, working primarily with the 17 public schools in Pittsburgh.

The theater involves the impact of the performing human being—the reach, if you will. We have had our most magnificient, rewarding, and exciting impact when we have performed in the so-called culturally disadvantaged areas because the reach there is difficult. To reach across apathy, across distrust, across a kind of closing off and alienation, you need the kind of impact that makes the connection. The performing arts are interactive, and they do make that connection. The reaching that we talk about in the theater is the kind of reaching that connects the performance to the human being sitting out there in the audience.

We all play roles; and somewhere along the line you must learn to use words in their natural form. We discovered when we performed in these culturally disadvantaged areas that many of the students had comes from homes where a kind of guttural exclamation took the place of words. Often too, their words were in no way connected with the emotion that was appropriate to them. There was no way for these children in their day-to-day lives to come to understand the beauty and magnificence of words.

Again, somewhere along the line, as well as learning the ritual of the society out of which you come, you have got to understand what is the role of the human being, who you are, what *connects* you to—and what separates you from—every human being who has ever lived. And this is *one* of the things the theater can do for you. Because, when a man stands on the stage and talks to you about war and about war being the destruction of the human race, and you suddenly remind yourself that he is using words that were written in Greece two and a half millennia ago, it gives you a sense of the fact that there may be some continuity to life after all.

We say that there have to be *live* actors performing this classic literature which educators have agreed belongs in the education of the human being. For the theater is the only art form where man stands on a stage and talks to man on *behalf* of man. And the theater is the art form devoted to, built on, and structured around behavior—the role of the human being, the study of man, and the explanation of man.

When we go into the high schools, we work in two ways. In the first, we put into the auditorium a stage set, complete with lighting and sound equipment, so that every performance can maintain the same high standard of excellence. Our performances run from an hour and 15 or 20 minutes to an hour and a half; they are designed to fit into two periods, back to back, not after school, not before school, not on Saturday—but during the schoolday. Our performance may consist, for example, of some scenes from *Richard III* linked to some scenes from Shaw's *St. Joan*. The theme running through this is: There are assassins among us, and there are powerful people among us. How can we tell who they are? What makes the difference between a man like Richard III, who obviously went to hell, and a saint like Joan? They were both powerful. They both could use people. What was the difference?

The second way we work is to take performers and bring them into the History and English classrooms. When I speak of bringing actors and actresses into the classrooms, I am speaking of people who are extraordinarily trained and educated, and who have this rare thing which is called talent, the talent to create while you watch them. They come into the classroom as specialists directly illuminating the educational material which the student has to study.

We do scenes from Shakespeare; we do dramas from all the dramatic poets; and we present the poet as a writer of direct communication, as a resource in the educational process. And we hope that what we are doing is illuminating for these students not just the moment that we are there, but that after we go, they look again into poetry because someone has come in and done something that has gotten them scared or happy or excited. They thought poetry was something that a lot of jerks did, with long hair, sitting under a big apple tree, in the garden. They suddenly find masks in poetry—vigrous poetry, live poetry, reflective poetry. Or they find that history is exciting and absorbing. There have been many history classes where the students have gone to the teacher after one of our performances and said such things as: "Now, listen, we've studied those Lincoln-Douglas debates, but we never got any of this. Could we read aloud some of *Washington's* speeches?"

This is what happens when you perform the characters honestly. You make them come alive, and suddenly the student understands that history is not full of faded figures in a book, or wax dummies, but people—people who coughed, and sneezed, and got scared, and cried, and stubbed their toes, and were human.

Miriam Cherin, general manager, the Vanguard Theater

We have a small company of nine people. The 3 actors and 1 actress are sometimes called upon to play 12 roles between them in 1 production. We also have three professional stagehands and two technical people who travel with the company. A scene designer, a voice and speech coach, a music consultant, and a sound consultant are on call. Our operation is not as tremendous and overwhelming a problem as you might think, particularly if there is a community theater or a resident theater or a university theater in your area that you can work with, as we have with the Pittsburgh Playhouse.

We have worked primarily with the 17 public high schools in Pittsburgh. We have a budget of about $60,000. We charge $600 a performing day, and this includes the auditorium production and six classroom presentations. From these figures you can see that these things can be handled by school systems within existing budgetary limitations.

III. Music

Coleman Blumfield,[*] consultant, Residential Living and Counseling Branch, Office of Economic Opportunity, 1200 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20506

I am well aware of the great performing arts centers that are springing up in the United States and of the millions of dollars that are being spent.

But it seems to me that a great gap exists when it comes to bequeathing this cultural heritage, whether it be drama, dance, or music, to our young people. It is my contention that the performing arts can be presented to young children of every socioeconomic group. I don't care whether they're "disadvantaged" or whether they're from the most sophisticated neighborhoods. They will respond, and respond spontaneously, if the work is presented properly.

My first 2 years as artist-in-residence to the city of Flint were devoted to professional performances for the adult population and to workshops or master classes for the talented piano students of Flint and its surrounding areas. Toward the end of my second year of residence, however, I tried an experiment.

Flint is, as you may know, the hometown of General Motors. The Greater Flint population is approximately 400,000, and there are about 50 elementary schools, 3 senior high schools, and about 10 junior high schools, along with a junior college, and a University of Michigan extension. As an experiment, I scheduled myself into the three senior high schools, during school hours, to perform an assembly program. I played works of the same standard as those I have played in Carnegie Hall or here in Constitution Hall. And the kids stood up and yelled in a way the Flint public schools had never heard before.

As a result, with the financial help of the city's businessmen and cultural leaders and with the blessing and cooperation of the Flint Board of Education, we began a systematic series of classical concerts in all the Flint schools—public and parochial. We performed for children who ranged in age from prekindergarten to college kids. An interesting thing about the 45,000 kids we reached the first year was that I personally received over 3,000 letters, and very few were written because "the teacher told me" to write them. And there were letters from parents, the school board, and from many of the civic leaders, too.

These performances were not just cold playing. I spoke to the children briefly of the merits of attending concerts, plays, art institutes, museums, going into the literary classics, and touched on some nontechnical information concerning the work and the composer. I tried, where I could, to draw the teachers in so that they could lead from a performance of, say, a Prokofiev sonata, into an historical discussion of that particular era—1939-42—in the Soviet Union.

The first year I began with a Schumann arabesque, a Chopin ballade and then the entire *Pictures at an Exhibition* of Mussorgsky. This last work alone runs about 30 minutes. The second year we expanded. We did a Bach organ toccata and fugue, a large Chopin work, and an entire contemporary sonata. In the elementary schools, we did not lower the standard; we just chose classical works of shorter duration. Besides the personal rewards that I received through letters and comments, there was a very marked increase in the number of young children going to the Art Institute of Flint and to concerts in Ann Arbor and Detroit. Flint is a bit deficient right now in theater, but they were attending some of their own school performances and they were going to concerts. Little by little, we began to see the results of this unique program.

---

[*] Coleman Blumfield has recently concluded a concert tour, under OEO sponsorship, of some 25 Job Corps centers and communities. Prior to this he was for 3 years artist-in-residence to the city of Flint, Mich.

Last summer, I became very concerned about the young people in the poverty war, and within 3 weeks of my initial contact with the Office of Economic Opportunity I was off on a first Job Corps tour. I went into areas that I don't think are even on the map, besides going into the large cities. And the reception was not just a polite acceptance; these Job Corps youngsters stood up and yelled as if somebody had hit a home run. Young corpsmen are writing to Mr. Shriver, and they are writing to me, asking, "When are we going to have more?"

And now Congress has legalized the performing arts in education, through passage of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of last year. And it is time now that we have a fruitful marriage. We wish, as performing artists, to build audiences that will fill to the brim the cultural centers that are coming up now. You, as educators, are in a unique position because you can make it possible for us to work together. There is nothing frightening about the performing arts; on the contrary, they provide education with marvelous resource materials, and with a marvelous motivational force. I can see no more perfect union in this country, at the present time, than that now coming into existence between the performing arts and the educators. I only wish that we had had this opportunity when we were all going to school.

When you are applying for artistic performances to be brought into the schools, however, please make sure that the experience will be of the highest professional excellence. Because it is very easy to introduce mediocrity in the arts, as in anything else. There is plenty of mediocrity around waiting to get a foothold and, once it does creep in, it's twice as hard to dislodge it as it would have been to provide excellence in the first encounter.

You may have to do some negotiating as far as fees are concerned, but our great American artists are available to the schools, if you want them. It seems to me that Title I of the new education act offers you the means to bring these people within reach of young people everywhere. Through them, we can build a new and fantastically productive cultural era in the United States.

Section III. MAJOR ADDRESSES

Education—The Ideal and the Reality

Hubert H. Humphrey

Vice President of the United States

Throughout history, we seem to have revered and honored education—and almost in the same breath we have also seemed to be damning the schools. (It's remotely possible, of course, that some of you have observed this phenomenon yourselves.)

Henry Adams—who thought well of education since he entitled his autobiography *The Education of Henry Adams*—asserted nonetheless that "the chief wonder of education is that it does not ruin everybody connected with it—teachers and taught."

Diogenes called education the foundation of every State. In fact, it was a truism among the ancient Greeks that only the educated are free. Yet Socrates was executed by the Athenians as a corrupter of youth—perhaps the first in a long line of martyrs to progressive education.

Our own American scholars, such as Jefferson and Emerson, have been loud in their advocacy of education and merciless in their criticism of "the academies."

You, as school officials, can undoubtedly call to mind a few other slings and arrows closer to your own time and circumstances.

We should remember, however, that this seeming contradiction in attitudes does not spring entirely from some innate perversity in man. The truth is that educational methods have never been good enough—and indeed may never be good enough—to feed man's insatiable hunger for knowledge and wisdom and useful skills.

The ideal, of course, is an educational system that will train, rather than chain, the human mind; that will uplift, rather than depress, the human spirit; that will illuminate, rather than obscure, the path to wisdom; that will help *every* member of society to the full use of his natural talents.

The desire to bring the reality of education closer to the ideal is here—as it has always been. But the gap between the two is better perceived and defined, I believe, than ever before.

Educators are being called upon to find ways to close the gap—as they have always been. But we are closer to a true understanding of the methods than before. Most important, we today have the opportunity, and the means, to put those ways to work throughout the Nation.

We see education, or the lack of it, as part of a larger social service system that has inadequacies—particularly for the poor in this affluent America. And so we have moved in numerous ways to improve those social services—in health, in welfare, in housing, in consumer protection, in urban development, in transportation. I need not tell you that a sick or a hungry child is never an eager or an alert learner.

In the field of education for the disadvantaged, the sixties have brought new programs and major improvements in old ones—Area Redevelopment Act training programs: Manpower development and training, economic development, vocational education, library services—and the whole range of antipoverty programs, including Head Start, Job Corps, Neighborhood Youth Corps, adult literacy, Upward Bound—and many more.

And to climax it all, we enacted the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965.

Of course, the exciting thing about the Elementary and Secondary Education Act is not merely that it offers aid to education. Through Title I of that act—with which you are primarily concerned here—this Nation has begun to clarify and define the true role of education in America.

It rejects the idea that the school is a mere facet of community life.

It rejects the idea that education is but a reflection—and a delayed reflection at that—of American thought. It expresses, instead, an understanding—not new in American life, but sometimes obscured—that education must lead rather than lag; that it is an instrument of creation rather than a mirror only, of the American dream.

It offers to the schools the opportunity to strike at the roots of poverty by bringing intellectual awakening to millions of children who have in the past found only frustration and rejection in the classroom.

If the Elementary and Secondary Education Act is sometimes referred to as a revolutionary step in American education, it is because it presents to the schools the magnificent opportunity of playing an active rather than a passive part in the continuing task of perfecting American democracy. The Commissioner of Education, Mr. Howe, has called you to this national conference, at President Johnson's request, so that you can help American educators make the most of that opportunity.

This national program to aid the educationally disadvantaged has been in actual operation only 10 short months. I think all of us here are probably agreed that, even in this short time, it has had a tremendous impact on our schools, and effected some substantial benefits for our children. Over 7 million deprived children have participated in projects funded under Title I this year.

But it isn't just gross numbers that impress me. I'm impressed with the imaginativeness, the innovativeness, the simple brilliance of some of the projects I've been reading about.

In Charleston, W. Va., dinner is served 1 night a week in the school cafeteria to about 135 impoverished parents and children. Parents pay 35 cents, children nothing. Parents and children then go to separate study sessions. Subjects taken up by the parents were selected by them, and include the new math, foreign affairs, and homemaking. The program is creating a new, close relationship between the school and the community and improving education for whole families.

In Tucson, Ariz., 200 college students are paired on a 1-to-1 basis with first graders from a slum school. They spend 1 hour each week together in an activity of their own choosing. The young adults are students in educational psychology, trained to ask questions and elicit responses which sustain interest, promote further reaction, and stimulate linguistic effort. It is the highlight of the week for both college students and first graders.

In New Mexico, Navajo children are going to summer school this year in a mobile classroom as they follow the herds across the summer grazing lands. In Arizona, Papago children go to jail to learn English: the tribal jail now houses a language laboratory center.

Mentally retarded teenagers in Bloomington, Ind., are being trained in a work-study project so they may continue a meaningful school curriculum and at the same time qualify for promised jobs in the community.

Some children have gained as much as 5 pounds in the first week of hot breakfast projects, and their ability to stay alert and participate in class has correspondingly improved.

In Rochester, N.Y., art action centers funded under Title I caused much excitement among both teachers and pupils. One nonverbal second grader began to talk after the first day in the art center.

Vice President Hubert Humphrey delivers the keynote address at the opening general session. Commissioner Howe and Secretary Gardner on the left; Under Secretary Wilbur Cohen and Director of Welfare Ellen Winston on the right.

What you are seeking here today are the ways to make every Title I project a quality project.

You are asked to chart the way—or at least to find some of the guideposts—by which your colleagues throughout the Nation can steer their course during the coming year.

You are dealing with a complicated set of social, psychological, and educational problems. There are no panaceas for instant healing of the cultural and psychological wounds which the disadvantaged child carries with him to school—or those which are, all too often, actually inflicted on him in the classroom.

We all know, however, that these scars will not yield to the same old bromides that have failed in the past. We must find new and original approaches to education or we will go on condemning millions of Americans to generation after generation of intellectual and economic deprivation. In truth, what we are doing in our schools today simply does not work well enough for most of our children, and it does not work at all for millions of children whose values and experiences differ from the middle-class norm.

This knowledge is profoundly disturbing, I know, to you and to educators all over the country. You and others are raising some basic questions about education which you will undoubtedly explore in depth at this meeting.

May this ex-teacher raise some of the questions which he knows are of concern to America's educators and to your Government:

- Are schools structured to suit the convenience of the teacher rather than the needs of the child?
- Do some of our schools stifle initiative and the development of self-mastery?
- Do we stamp some children with *failure* from the day they enter the first grade?
- Are we actually reinforcing, in the classroom, the sense of inadequacy, of humiliation, of hopelessness, that begins in a deprived home environment?
- Can it be that our schools actually contribute to nonlearning among the children of the poor?

If any of these things are true, then it is time we reexamined some of the time-honored shibboleths of the profession and sought new insight into the educational process.

You will not, of course, be able to find all the answers at this conference, but you will make progress toward that goal. America is determined to build a Great Society in which all her citizens can be full participants. You are here to help move us forward toward that goal. You are going back to your own States to hold similar conferences with your colleagues there. Yours will be the responsibility of transmitting to them the fresh and invigorating ideas which are bound to come from your discussions here.

Our goal of a Great Society is based, first and foremost, upon our abiding faith that all levels of government and all social institutions in this great land are ready and anxious to play their full role in moving America forward.

The Elementary and Secondary Education Act was perceived by the President and enacted by the Congress in the true spirit of a creative federalism which reflects that faith. It places, in fact, the principal areas of responsibility right where responsibility for education has always been in America—at the State and local level.

Local school superintendents and their staffs have the freedom to develop Title I projects tailored to the specific needs of the deprived children in their own communities. And they have the responsibility for seeing that the projects work toward that purpose. Theirs is the first, and the decisive, role in the three-way partnership.

State officials have a responsibility to review carefully the proposals of the local schools to make doubly sure that this great program is actually working to meet the needs of the children for whom it is intended. But their responsibility cannot end with merely approving or rejecting those proposals. Some schools in every State—usually those that need good Title I projects the most—lack the staff or the time or the originality to do effective planning on their own. Here is where State leadership can make itself felt.

We have heard much—and appropriately so—about our urban problems. But let us not overlook the special problems of our rural areas. Here especially we must provide adequate technical assistance—on all levels.

There is no room for apathy or pedestrianism at either State or local level. Enthusiasm, originality, and sound planning are the keys to making this program work. State and local superintendents must carry their full share in the partnership. If they do not, they are turning their backs not only on opportunity but on the children who look to them for help. The tragic loss will be all America's.

I am sure that one of the problems for which you will be seeking solutions at your conference is one which has beset the schools for many years. And it is a problem that new educational programs—for the time being, at least—tend to make worse rather than better. That is the shortage of trained teachers and other skilled school personnel.

Over the years, through such new programs as the Teacher Corps and through special scholarship and training programs, I am sure that we will be able to attract many more people into the schools. I believe too that the new and invigorating climate of education in this country, the opportunity for doing challenging and worthwhile work, is already stimulating a new trend back into the educational professions.

The problem, of course, is that today's children cannot wait for tomorrow's teachers. The shortage is going to persist for some years, but already we have begun, and particularly in the Title I projects, to find some new solutions to the problem.

Commissioner Howe tells me that he has urged chief State school officers to take the lead in recruiting teacher aides, part-time staff, and volunteers to help out in the schools. I want to add my voice to his in urging you to explore this sensible, and typically American, solution to the teacher shortage. It is typically American because it is based upon an American tradition that is at least as old as the "little red schoolhouse"—the tradition of community involvement and participation in education. Our forefathers built their own schools with the help of their neighbors. They had box suppers and bazaars and hoe-downs to raise money to keep the schools going. They took turns providing bed and board for the "schoolmarm." (That's part of the tradition I imagine most schoolteachers are glad to see is on the way out.)

In recent years, it seems to me, schools have too often tended to become aloof from the community. It is time we reversed this tendency. The problems we face in our schools today are too big for the schools alone. They require that all the resources of the community be put to work.

Last year some 50,000 teacher aides were at work in our schools, freeing the teachers from routine duties to do a better job of teaching. When school opens this fall, many more will undoubtedly be on the job.

I am sure that many homemakers who are qualified teachers would be willing to work part time if the need were known to them.

And let us not forget the volunteers. If there is any doubt that community volunteers can make a willing contribution to education, I refer you to the experience of the Head Start program, which in its first year recruited nearly 100,000 volunteer helpers, as well as 46,000 paid neighborhood workers.

The truth is that the American school, and particularly the school serving the poor, can no longer afford, for many reasons, to be an island cut off from community life. There is a mutual need: The community needs the school, and the school needs to become a real part of the community. Here again, Head Start has made the point quite clear. In last summer's program alone, more than half a million disadvantaged kids were reached and given a short but wonderful experience. We know how dramatic and hopeful have been the immediate results of this experience.

But many are asking—and I now ask: Will Head Start be a waste because the community does not do the necessary followthrough on the health and family problems detected? Or because the schools to which the Head Starters go just are not good enough or resourceful enough?

There are many ways we must employ to secure constructive cooperation between the school and the community. Let me cite just a few.

Active involvement of parents—a hallmark of Head Start—must be stepped up at all levels of elementary and secondary schools. This is particularly true in districts where our disadvantaged children go to school. The children will benefit; the parents will benefit; the school will benefit; and the community will benefit.

Our private organizations—labor, business, civil rights, fraternal, women's, and civic—are looking for a chance to serve. It is your responsibility and opportunity to add this important resource.

Dedicated and talented students in nearby colleges and universities represent a rich source of tutors for disadvantaged children—as the burgeoning student-tutorial movement attests.

I have already referred to the need for educators to be concerned with the broad range of social services which must complement education as such. To all of this must also be added the need to face with increasing determination the issue of segregation in our schools.

I want to stress in the strongest possible terms, that we must press forward vigorously toward full integration of our schools.

In our large cities particularly, economic factors and the movement to the suburbs are creating serious racial imbalance in the inner city schools.

Many States and communities have developed ESEA projects which successfully aid the cause of school integration. They are showing that we can have both *quality and equality* in our schools.

It is unthinkable that compensatory education should be misused as an excuse to postpone integration. For the two are in reality effective and complementary allies in achieving our objective—an educational system in which every child can lift up his head and glimpse the true vision of America.

For our goal is nothing less than the fulfillment of the American dream. It is the goal expressed a generation ago by the American author Thomas Wolfe:

"To every man his chance, to every man, regardless of his birth, his shining, golden opportunity. To every man the right to live, to work, to be himself, and to become whatever thing his manhood and his vision can combine to make him. This . . . is the promise of America."

The Task Ahead

Dr. Ralph W. Tyler

Director, Center for Advanced Study in the Behavioral Sciences, Stanford, Calif.

With the aid of Federal funds, the schools of America are now engaged in a concentrated attempt to improve the educational opportunities for disadvantaged children. The purpose of this intensified effort is to enable children who suffer from a variety of handicaps to acquire, through learning, the same educational objectives as other children so that all may participate constructively in our civil life, in our economic endeavors, in fulfilling and enjoying the responsibilities of family members, and in realizing as fully as possible their own individual potential. The aim is not to establish a substitute program for those heretofore thought to be incapable of learning but to provide means that will help the disadvantaged eventually to become full participants in our society.

This endeavor precludes the provision of busywork and play to occupy the time of children who will be given no effective opportunities to learn those things that are essential to intelligent citizenship, occupational competence, constructive parenthood, and breadth and depth of personal enjoyment. That learning which is important for more fortunate children is the aim for those who are disadvantaged. The path to reach this goal and the rate of progress may be different, but we shall not be satisfied until we have devised ways by which all children may become lifelong learners.

Educational disadvantages are of many sorts, and an individual child may suffer from one or more of them. Among the more common handicaps to learning are: limited early experience in learning in the home and neighborhood; no encouragement given to learning; lack of confidence in one's ability to learn; limitations in early language development; lack of attractive examples of learning in the home or neighborhood that would serve to stimulate learning; lack of supporting materials and facilities in the home, neighborhood or school, such as places for study, books, art objects, musical performances. Further common handicaps are imposed when values instilled in the home are in conflict with values assumed in the school, when the content of school learning is perceived by the child as irrelevant to his life, interests, and needs, or when the child suffers from inadequate nutrition, ill health, or physical and mental disabilities. These educational disadvantages may result from various conditions such poverty, a broken home, a low educational level in the home or neighborhood, or the fact that the English language is not used in the home. Or they may be caused by delinquency or neglect in the child's home or neighborhood, by family ill health, or by limited community services in the areas of education, health, recreation, and culture.

Because of the range of possible educational handicaps and the variety of contributing factors, disadvantaged children are to be found in all States and in most localities. The patterns of problems are different among different schools, but the tragic impact upon the child remains whenever he suffers serious educational limitations. The evidence obtained from current investigations indicates that for most disadvantaged children the gap between their educational attainments and those of average children continues to widen with each school year. Children from a city or rural slum are commonly a year behind their more fortunate age-mates when 4 years old; by age 12 they are commonly 3 years or more behind. We face difficult tasks in seeking to strengthen the educational environment from early childhood throughout the years of schooling.

Although the task of compensating for severe educational handicaps is hard and complex, almost all communities have some resources on which they can draw to attack this problem. We have some knowledge that has already been obtained from the experience of school people and from research studies. I am confident that additional helpful knowledge will be obtained from some of the programs recently instituted, and from the investigations undertaken by educational research and development centers and by regional laboratories. We now know that in early childhood, experience in discriminating sense impressions, particularly those of sound and sight, provides a basis for language learning. We know that extensive oral language experience at ages 2 to 5 involving conventional vocabulary and syntax is an important basis for learning to read. We know that the attitude of parents and peers toward school learning is a factor influencing children's confidence and efforts. We know that early success in learning builds motivation for continued learning. These are only a few illustrations of knowledge which we can now use in guiding our planning and our work. More will be increasingly available.

A second resource which many schools can use is the parents of the disadvantaged children. Most parents really care about the welfare and progress of their sons and daughters, but they lack understanding of how they can help, and they may be deficient in the skills required. Most of them need guidance and encouragement, for they often lack confidence in their own ability to help their children.

The sincerely dedicated teachers and administrators to be found in most schools provide another important source that is essential to a successful assault on the problem. The willingness of many professional educators to take the time and effort to get to know each child in difficulty, to study the background information that may help in working with him, and to learn new ways of teaching and counseling should not be underestimated. This provides us with a very worthwhile mission and a sense of pioneering on a major frontier.

Many laymen, too, can be enlisted in the campaign. As loyal citizens and people who care about others, many of us are ready and able to use our time and our own selves, if we can be sure that we can be used constructively. The contributions laymen can make will vary with the needs of the children and with the roles to be filled when the educational program is worked out. Generally, however, with careful attention to the necessary training and supervision, laymen will provide an important resource in many schools.

A fifth resource on which we can draw are the many aids to learning which are already available and which may be constructed and tested in these new programs. Blocks, pictures, games, movies, tapes, records, responsive electronic devices, programed materials, typewriters, simple apparatus for experiments, new tools and instruments—these are among the more obvious aids that may be employed. However, there use should be guided by educational purpose and plan. Too frequently, we purchase aids before we have any clearcut use in mind. Instead, we need to work out the steps to be taken to aid the child's learning and to see which of these steps can be facilitated by appropriate use of learning aids.

A sixth kind of resource available in many localities is that of community agencies other than the school. Health and social services of various sorts, recreational opportunities, library services, museum offerings, musical performances, work opportunities and the like are sometimes available from community agencies and organizations. In some cases, these agencies are interested in, and are able to develop, new services or will modify older ones to meet imperative needs of children. Where they can be obtained, services of this sort constitute a very helpful resource.

Finally, but not least, we ought to recognize that a major resource in dealing with these difficult problems is the intelligence and ingenuity of the school leaders. In many communities there are no present blueprints or doctrines to guide them in the development of effective programs. Fortunately, leaders in American schools are accustomed to striking out on new paths and solving new problems. The education of disadvantaged children represents an opportunity for imaginative administrators and teachers to design new programs to meet our aspirations.

The job of devising and instituting ways to enable disadvantaged children to become full participants in our society and to achieve their own self-realization is a hard one. We are fortunate to have a number of resources on which to draw as we undertake the task.

How can we best proceed in developing an effective program in an individual school?

Since the particular patterns of handicaps among children vary from school to school and since the resources available also vary, we cannot expect a single National, State, county, or even citywide program to be appropriate for any individual school. In significant respects the constructive means for aiding the disadvantaged children in one school will not be identical with those in another. Hence the task we face is one of devising programs as well as implementing them.

I emphasize the need for individual program designs because we are all anxious to get ahead with the job as soon as funds are available. But this can be unwise, wasteful, and disappointing unless we are embarked on a program appropriate for the problems in our school. I would urge that the first step undertaken in each school be a careful study of the kinds of handicaps found among the disadvantaged children in the school. Which children have deficiencies in language development? Which children find schoolwork irrelevant to their concerns? Which children lack confidence in their ability to learn? What are the inadequacies of the home and neighborhood environment for each child? With these and other relevant questions as a basis for searching inquiry, a list of the learning deficiencies and obstacles in the path of his educational development can be made for each disadvantaged child. Such a catalog serves to set the specific program tasks in helping each child to surmount his handicaps.

A second step is to review what is now known about these obstacles to learning and the ways in which they can be attacked. This review furnishes initial leads about what needs to be done. Limitations in sensory perception of young children may be partly overcome through systematic practice in sensory discrimination. A small English vocabulary and lack of conventional linguistic patterns among primary children may be attacked by active participation in listening, discussing, and reporting in oral English. The inclusion of learning experiences in which reading, mathematics, science, and social studies are involved in problems with which the students are vitally concerned can help to reduce the alienation from schoolwork viewed as irrelevant by the pupils. A new selection and more careful grading of learning experiences will often help students to find that they can make progress in learning, and the teacher can aid by expressing approval and encouraging the child in his learning efforts.

These are only a few examples illustrative of the suggestions emerging from experience and published reports about ways to attack the problems identified in the initial study of the disadvantaged children in one's own school.

Once one has obtained ideas about ways of attacking these problems, it is useful to survey the resources available in the school and community on which one can draw or which can be mobilized, organized, and trained for the implementation of the ideas suggested. Are there public or private health agencies that could work on the health problems? What social agencies might be able to meet the nutritional needs of the chronically undernourished? Are the parents from homes that are giving little aid to learning sufficiently interested in their children to be willing to undergo training and undertake some of the guidance and encouragement of their children's learning? Are there agencies or volunteers that would be willing to read to young children and stimulate language usage? Which teachers have experience in parent education that could be used in training parents and laymen? Which are deeply interested in these children and have experience on which individualized learning programs might be carried on? What consultants are available who have special competence relating to some of the problems? These are a few of the questions that one can ask in connection with a survey of the resources that might be drawn upon in devising and carrying on a program that could provide substantial help to disadvantaged children in their learning.

Having identified the serious problems of the disadvantaged children in one's own school, having brought together a number of ideas about the ways in which problems could be attacked, and having surveyed the resources that could be mobilized, one has the information and suggestions from which a local program can be formulated systematically to furnish help on each problem and to provide individual guidance and graduated learning experiences from early childhood throughout the years of schooling. Such a program must meet several criteria.

In the first place, within the program should be found all the provisions needed to attack the problems identified. Usually these would include, when appropriate, a range of activities such as: parent training in helping young children with language learning and problem solving; special opportunities outside the home for young children to gain sensory discrimination, language habits, interest in learning, and confidence in their ability to learn; habits of punctuality and responsibility; opportunities in the school to continue these elementary learning experiences; revision of the school curriculum to give more attention to content relevant to the children's interests and needs, and a more gradual sequence of learning experiences; opportunities for older children to take partial responsibility for some of the learning activities of younger ones; individual practice materials; utilization of a wider range of learning experiences such as games, audio-visual aids, work responsibilities and the like; and extension of constructive learning opportunities and related features of a stimulating environment to the entire neighborhood, including recreation, community service, and the like. It is not enough to have a little change here and there. Significant impact on the education of disadvantaged children requires consistent efforts over the whole period of childhood and youth. This calls for a carefully planned comprehensive program.

In the second place, the program must be sound and thoroughly worked out. There is no place here for superficiality. We are always tempted to boast of having adopted a popular practice without having carefully analyzed it and supported it with the necessary understanding and training. The impediments in the way of learning encountered by disadvantaged children are so serious that we must understand them and spend the time and effort needed to become competent to work effectively on them. We must not expect that some attractive title or some simple principle can include all that we must do. Every step of the way we must try to see clearly what needs to be done and how to do it, and then get the training and the materials to do it well.

In the third place, we must plan and work on a program that represents a big step forward. Minor adjustments, small contributions of time and energy are too little to do more than frustrate both teachers and pupils. Unless we invest enough time, thought, and energy to create a critical mass—to use a term often employed in science—we will get no return.

When the plan for the program is being worked out, attention should also be given to the evaluative process that will furnish periodically evidence of how the program is succeeeding and where inadequacies are being encountered. This continuing appraisal is necessary to afford a basis for making necessary improvements in the program and for detecting weaknesses before it is too late to eliminate them. However, in many cases the instruments for appraisal will need to be devised or obtained from special projects now under way.

Widely used achievement tests are focused on the educational performances of average children, since this affords the most efficient use of testing time where the purpose is to measure the mean or median achievement of class groups. Typically, 80 percent of all the test exercises lie within the band of 40 percent to 60 percent level of difficulty. There are so few exercises representative of the current achievement of disadvantaged children that their scores on most of these tests are not greatly different from zero. This does not mean that they have learned nothing. The test has not sampled reliably the levels of learning with which they may have been involved. For this reason new tests are being constructed to aid in the evaluation.

In addition to tests, we need accurate reports on the learning activities undertaken, on results of observations and interviews with representative samples of disadvantaged children focused on their learning practices, and on the development of attitudes, interests, and habits relevant to the educational objectives. Some schools are devising promising plans for evaluation that may be more widely useful. At least annually, but preferably more often, evaluation data should be reviewed and studied, and the implications for program modification carefully considered. In this way we can hope to make constructive improvements in programs through experience.

I think it is clear to all of us, but still worth reiterating, that the handicaps of disadvantaged children are serious and will not be overcome in a short time. This problem calls for long-range plans, not for temporary makeshifts. Each individual child needs years of learning experiences which are meaningful to him, which he can master at each stage of his development, from which he can gain confidence and competence, and from which he can emerge able to participate without serious limitations in all the important functions of modern life. So for him we must plan a program with which he can work for 14 or more years.

To develop a program that is highly effective requires the further education of personnel, the devising of curricula, teaching procedures and materials of instruction, and the testing and modification of plans and materials through evaluation experience. Hence, for a school to reach an adequate stage in its work with disadvantaged children will take several years. If we are seriously determined to raise the educational opportunities for these pupils, we must think of this as part of the long-time responsibility of the school. It is not an ephemeral effort which can be forgotten in a few years.

The conditions of life today require the education of everyone who would participate fully in it. At least 15 percent to 20 percent of our children are not now attaining the level of education required for employment, for intelligent citizenship, for responsible parenthood, or for achieving their own individual potential. These disadvantaged children include those with one or more of various kinds of educational handicaps arising from a corresponding variety of physical, educational, cultural, and emotional conditions. The children are distributed throughout our country, but the particular patterns of handicaps vary widely among the schools. The task for each of us is to study the disadvantaged children in our own school, seeking to understand their handicaps and then to work out a comprehensive program for the school, a program that is calulated to make an effective attack upon the problems these children face and that uses the resources available to the school. As the program is carried on, periodic appraisal should provide bases for improvements.

Over a period of time, we can hope to develop paths by which the disadvantaged children in each school may learn to participate with their more fortunate companions more fully in American life. This is a difficult and long-time task, but it is so essential to our political and social ideals and successful efforts will be so rewarding that this hard job is worth our big investment.

The Vice President greets conferees following his address.

Remarks

Lyndon B. Johnson

President of the United States

When Secretary Gardner told me that he was planing to visit with you, I asked him if I could come along.

I have a very brief message to bring: No group anywhere in this Nation is charged with a problem more urgent that yours.

You are at work on the bedrock foundations of all we ever hope to build in America.

You work along a lonely frontier—as exposed and, in some ways, as hazardous as the soldiers' outpost in Vietnam. On both battlefronts the future of free men will get its toughest testing.

To reach the disadvantaged child's mind—to tear away the awful shrouds that dim the light of learning—to break barriers built by poverty and fear and racial injustice—this is the most exciting task of our times.

We have not asked you to come to Washington because the Federal Government has the *answers.*

But we have the *questions* and we like to believe that is the beginning of wisdom.

Our Federal program is based on a simple proposition: that it costs *more* not *less* to educate a disadvantaged child. It takes the *best* not the *mediocre* teachers. It calls for the three I's of education—inspiration and innovation and ideas—if we are going to get anywhere with the three R's.

That is why we made Title I the granddaddy of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act—over *five* times larger than all the other titles combined.

That is why we have fought so hard to found and to fund the Teacher Corps.

I believe the school bill now on the books is the most creative legislation passed by Congress since I came to Washington.

But it will be a sterile piece of paper unless you breathe life into the programs that flow from it.

Since I became President, we have increased the total funds for education and training from just under $5 billion to over $10 billion.

But these billions will be wasted unless you have the vigor and the vision to spend them wisely.

That is why we have invited you to Washington.

We hope you will have an opportunity to review your plans, exchange your ideas, describe your problems—and then go back home and work double time on your programs.

I would like to add one word of caution: Some enthusiasts argue that if a $10 billion education program is good this year, $20 billion would be better.

Your President cannot leap to easy conclusions like that.

He must ask certain questions.

He must ask his advisers whether a sudden, large increase of funds makes good sense in educational terms. Their answer is that it definitely does not. On the contrary, they argue that it could lead to waste and mismanagement which would bring discredit to the program.

Your President must ask his advisers what would be the effect of a large deficit in the Federal budget. They reply that it could trigger inflationary pressures and undermine all that you are attempting to accomplish.

And your President must ask his advisers whether he could justify such an increase by cutting back on other programs—for health, for Head Start, for making our cities a decent place to live. But our schools do not operate in a vacuum. And I don't believe educators want us to cripple these other programs that are vital to their communities.

Your President must get answers to all these questions when he makes a judgment. But of one thing you can be sure: So long as I hold this office, education will continue to be the "first work of our time." And educators will occupy a place of honor at the banquet table.

When you go back home, I hope you will pass the word to all your associates. Your President cares deeply about what you are doing. He has a lot of money and a lot of hope riding on you.

A New Benchmark for Education

Harold Howe II

U.S. Commissioner of Education

I am here tonight to thank you for your time, your interest and your creative contributions to this conference. I am also here to try to take an honest look at perhaps the most demanding challenge confronting American elementary and secondary education—the challenge of helping the schools do more for those students who come to the classroom with a built-in disadvantage.

As we go about this exercise of looking at our problems, it is important to keep a decent perspective, lest we seem to be saying that nothing is good about American education. We all know that much of the activity in our schools is first rate. I think it is entirely accurate to say that the United States provides more education to more people than any other nation in the world.

Remarkable advances are taking place in many of our schools. Some communities have taken positive and successful steps toward providing equal opportunity for all children and toward introducing promising innovations in teaching methods and tools. Consolidation of the schools in many States is providing a richer education for hundreds of thousands of children. The general public interest in improving education has reached unprecedented levels during the past 10 years, and the actions of our President and our Congress have made us an education-conscious Nation.

But as we take pride in these achievements, we must recognize that innovative education and high quality education and equal educational opportunity are not available to many of America's children. And we must recognize also that the children who are least served by the new push of the last 10 years to improve the schools are those who are most in need of special help: the minority group children—the Negroes, the Puerto Ricans, the Mexican-Americans. Add to them the children of those we call "poor whites" and you have about 20 percent of America's school-age young people, those between 5 and 17. It is because of these children that we have Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. And it is because of them that you and I are here in Washington tonight to share our ideas on how to make better use of the magnificent opportunity this act gives us as educators.

As we consider next steps to improve what we are doing with Title I funds in the service of disadvantaged children, we have the benefit of new insights into our problem of providing equal educational opportunity. These insights come from a scholarly study of the status of our efforts in desegregating the schools, in upgrading the education offered to disadvantaged children, in giving these youngsters a sense of their own worth in the national community.

The study I speak of is summarized in a 33-page booklet published by the Office of Education and entitled *Equality of Educational Opportunity*. My feeling is that the data lying behind this publication will have—and most certainly should have—a deep and lasting effect on American education. I would like to discuss the report this evening because it bears on the subject of our conference.

The booklet presents the preliminary findings of an undertaking instigated by the Congress in the Civil Rights Act of 1964. The Congress directed the Commissioner of Education to survey "the lack of equal educational opportunities for individuals by reason of race, color, religion, or national origin at all levels in the United States, its territories and possessions, and the District of Columbia." The full 700-page report is expected to be off the presses by the end of this month.

The project ultimately involved some 60,000 teachers and 645,000 pupils in 4,000 schools across the Nation and in its territories.

So far as I know, this is the largest, most comprehensive and most scientific look that has ever been given to the schools—and the schoolchildren—of the United States. We asked some straightforward questions, and we assume we got straightforward answers.

I stress the fact that the findings I shall refer to tonight need further interpretation. It will be many months before the data collected in a survey of this magnitude can be fully evaluated, so that firm recommendations for public policy can flow from them. I stress, too, the fact that the information on which the report is based was gathered last fall—before any title I projects really got launched. So, although the survey was not made with Title I in mind, I think it may provide a reliable baseline for measuring the impact of the various Title I programs now underway.

The survey is in effect an effort to describe statistically the extent of educational opportunity which exists through the country for the minority groups as compared to the white majority.

In the months and years ahead the Office of Education staff, aided by advisors from the educational community throughout the country, will be studying how the survey findings can sharpen our current programs and what implications they have for future directions.

But the study does not belong to the Office of Education. It belongs to the Nation, and I would encourage other groups, public and private, to explore it carefully. In particular, I invite the attention of those of you here tonight. Challenge the survey, hypothesize from it, learn from it. I especially ask for your cooperation because I think that in many ways the survey's implications and the applications of title I are complementary.

Now, let's take a look at what we have found so far—and what the survey might seem to suggest to the States and the local school systems most of you represent.

We found that for all practical purposes, American education can be labeled as segregated.

Over two-thirds of all Negro pupils in the first grade go to schools that are 90 to 100 percent Negro; only a handful of the Nation's Negro first graders are getting the benefit of desegregated education. In the light of the 1954 Supreme Court ruling, the requirements of the Civil Rights Act, and the further finding of this survey that segregated education is likely to be of lower quality for minority group children than for the majority, these facts should give us pause.

Turning to the general characteristics of schools, in one part of the survey we measured such matters as the age of the school building, the average number of pupils per classroom, whether there was a library, a cafeteria, a chemistry laboratory. We asked about accreditation, accelerated curriculum, use of the track system, salaries of principals, debate teams and bands, teacher tenure.

Next we turned to the classroom and asked questions of the students themselves. Some of the questions were designed to give us an index of socioeconomic factors; others, an academic achievement rate of verbal and mathematical results.

Among other things we found that many of the obvious differences among schools do not have a major bearing on differences in student achievement. Within that finding, however, it was also clear that achievement of disadvantaged pupils does depend to a statistically significant degree on the schools they attend—considerably more than for children of the white majority.

Put another way, advantaged students are less affected one way or the other by the quality of their schools. It is for the most disadvantaged children that improvements in school quality mean the most.

This finding obviously has significant implications. It seems to say, for example, that a program like Title I can make a difference if we are skillful enough to use it effectively. But before I jump to this or any other conclusion, I want to offer you the same caveat I offered my staff when we first discussed the survey. I think we must steadfastly refrain from reaching for quick, simplified conclusions. I believe we all need to spend considerable time with the full report—all 700-odd pages of it—before we can make plans for special projects and programs based upon it. We have to insert a step between implication and application, and that step should involve very careful study—not just speculation.

Next, let's take a look at the teachers we surveyed—60,000 of them.

We sought information about how much they earn, what they majored in at college, years of teaching experience, average scores on a verbal test, and so on.

The results were not especially surprising. In some ways—though by no means all—they were reassuring. The figures indicate that the quality of teachers defined in terms of the factors I have just listed bears a much stronger relationship to student achievement than does the quality of the school. Furthermore, a good teacher's impact on students appears to be greatest at the higher grades. And third, teacher quality seems to be significantly more important to the disadvantaged boy or girl than to the advantaged student.

These facts have interesting implications too, particularly when they are put against other information that emerged from the study—information which shows that disadvantaged students tend to wind up with the least capable teachers. We must, then, link this fact with the finding that it is the disadvantaged child who most needs a good teacher and who can gain the most from him. Parenthetically, it seems to me worth noting that Congress wisely preguessed these survey findings by forming the National Teacher Corps. This new enterprise is the only effort on a countrywide basis to train high quality teachers specifically for working with disadvantaged children.

Now that I have suggested some implications concerning schools and teachers, let us turn to the children. We asked 145,000 of them to take an achievement test, designed to measure verbal and mathematical skills that are most important in our society for getting a good job, moving up to a better one, and keeping on top of an increasingly technical world.

We also touched upon such matters as student attitudes and aspirations in the survey. And in the process we came upon one pupil attitude that appears to affect achievement more than all other school factors together. I refer to the extent to which the individual student feels he has some control over his destiny—over the possibility of his own success or failure. Far more than the average youngster, the disadvantaged boy or girl feels that his future lies in the lap of the gods, that whether he succeeds or fails will be determined primarily by blind chance rather than by his own efforts.

Such findings raise interesting questions about what schools can do to build confidence and self-assurance—qualities characteristically lacking in a great many disadvantaged pupils. We must explore the implications here for counselors in the schools, for school organization, and for the human relationships which exist between pupil and teacher.

The survey also demonstrated that when the disadvantaged child walks in the schoolhouse door for the first time, he scores lower on standard achievement tests than his advantaged peers. And by the time he reaches the 12th grade, the gap has widened considerably. Whatever may be the combination of nonschool factors which put minority children at a disadvantage when they enter first grade—poverty, community attitudes, low educational level of parents—the schools have not only failed to make up the diffierence, they have let these youngsters slip further away from the mainstream of our national life.

This fact presents a sobering challenge to American education. The survey report is full of such challenges. And thus our schools have—for the first time, to my knowledge—a benchmark. Against that benchmark, in the next 2 or 3 years, we can measure the impact of programs like the Elementary and Secondary Education Act in the schools.

One more item from the survey about students: The findings strongly suggest that perhaps the most significant element in creating opportunity for disadvantaged pupils is to put them in school with children who are not disadvantaged. I want to emphasize that the educational effectiveness of a mixture of children from different backgrounds does not refer only to racial integration. It also refers to economic and social integration. It means that if you put a small group of disadvantaged Negro children in a class with a large group of white children from middle-class homes, the Negro children will profit appreciably by that association almost without regard to the quality of the school. And it means that if you put white children from an urban slum in a classroom with middle-class children—white or Negro—the disadvantaged white children's schoolwork will also improve. On the other hand, if you took two groups of disadvantaged children—some Negro, some white—and put them in the same classroom, neither group would receive the kind of stimulation for added learning achievement that our survey findings reveal. Such integration would perhaps improve the social attitudes of both Negro and white children, but it would not necessarily produce intellectual stimulus.

Finally—on this matter of students stimulating other students—our survey findings indicate that the integration of children from different social and economic backgrounds helps the disadvantaged without harming the education of the advantaged.

The major point to remember is that when we are talking about public policy and placing youngsters of varied backgrounds in school together to create the best learning situation, we are talking economic and social factors every bit as much as racial factors.

The report also says this to us: that the neighborhood school concept is going to be subjected to considerably more study and debate, much of it doubtless heated. I think we must all agree that neighborhood schools have served us well and continue to do so in many areas of the Nation.

But the extraordinary population shifts taking place in our country make it necessary that we take a close look at what the meaning of the word "neighborhood" has come to include. To a disturbing degree it has come to mean the polarization of families according to the size of their split-level homes or the size of their welfare checks. We are faced with the fact that we are becoming a nation of plush suburbs on one hand and midcity slums on the other. Economically and socially, and in the ability of millions of American citizens to achieve their aspirations, the two show signs of becoming separate and even antagonistic continents.

The schools in the suburbs teach children who live in a world of wall-to-wall carpeting, pleasant backyards, and summers at camp. The parents demand quality education, and they have the political muscle and the capacity to tax that make this demand stick.

But they also have the capacity to forget that their neighbors in the central city have children who play in alleys and live six to a room. These people share the suburbanite's interest in quality education, but they can support it only with their spirit, not their pocketbooks.

Let me emphasize here a fact that often gets lost in our discussions on civil rights: Deprived children come in assorted colors. When we talk about the "disadvantaged" we are not speaking only of Negro children. Nor are poverty and want strictly urban afflictions. There are rural enclaves—in Appalachia and in the Ozarks, to mention just two—where Anglo-Saxon Americans still live in tarpaper shacks and cannot read or write or earn a decent living. And there are pockets of poor whites within the boundaries of our industrial cities.

These are the reasons why we will have to reappraise where the boundary lines of neighborhoods should be drawn when we speak of "the neighborhood school." It is essential that we give youngsters a glimpse of American life as Americans of every stratum actually live it. Among other things, this means operating our school systems in a fashion that encompasses the rich social, economic, and cultural diversity that distinguishes our Nation.

None of us is sure what changes should be made in school policy and organization. But we are rapidly developing a useful shopping list of ideas for experimentation. States and local school boards will have to determine what approaches best fit their particular situations. Certainly they can be helped by Title I funds as they make changes of a variety of kinds.

Learned Hand once observed that "it is well enough to put one's faith in education, but the kind makes a vast difference." I suspect that in the surge of faith in education that has characterized the last few years, too many Americans have neglected to pay enough attention to what kinds of education we are talking about—what standards of quality we have in mind and how universal we believe quality education should be. I congratulate all of those here tonight who have taken on the responsibility of leading the drive to give *all* our children the best education that money, talent, training, and initiative can provide.

Your success in providing that leadership and marshaling the good will and resources of the American people toward the achievement of equal opportunity will provide the final comment on the survey I have been reviewing tonight. Your actions in the next 12 months and the next decade will determine whether the report on equal educational opportunity becomes a plan for progress, or whether it remains nothing more than an interesting, well-documented diagram of inequalities which exist in 1966 and will continue to exist in the years that follow.

Section IV. COMMENTS BY PANELISTS

Comments by Panelists

At the close of the conference, panelists were invited to submit brief comments relating to the work of the conference or expressing their own views on education of the disadvantaged.

Regarding the conduct and accomplishments of the conference, most of the panelists commented favorably, and many offered generous praise. A number gave valuable suggestions for making future meetings more productive. A few expressed grave dissatisfaction with the makeup, conduct, and usefulness of the conference.

The Office of Education, and the conference staff, are grateful for these candid expressions of opinion—both the "bouquets" and the "brickbats." Panelists' suggestions will be carefully studied and taken into account in the planning of future meetings.

For inclusion in this section of the conference report, however, only statements bearing directly on the subject matter of the conference have been selected, and these are, of necessity, excerpts only.

Not every panelist is represented. In the interest of brevity and to avoid unnecessary reiteration of the same or similar points of view, the comments quoted below were chosen to present to the reader a broad range of panelist opinion. In no sense should they be regarded as summarizing the views held by the panelists. On the contrary, this section of the conference report purports to do no more than offer a series of interesting vignettes which, it is hoped, will prove stimulating and thought provoking and serve as a useful supplement to the Summary of Panel Discussions (section I).

Edward B. Fort, director, Division of Instruction, Detroit Public Schools

The issue of school desegregation is the area wherein school leaders can really prove their leadership.

Arthur Pearl, professor of education, University of Oregon

There was anger expressed at the conference, anger at those who argued that this was not the best of all possible worlds, those who insisted that education is falling farther behind in meeting the needs of youth. This is misplaced anger. The anger should be at those institutions which inhibit growth. Title I must be a beachhead for schools; it must (1) provide everyone freedom of life choice, (2) generate skills necessary to citizenship in a complicated democratic society, (3) develop capacity to be a culture carrier, and (4) foster the strength to thrive in a mass society. The conference failed to crack through complacency. The conference did not provide a conceptual outlook for wholesale educational change. Thus, this major job is still before us. At the present time we are too timid, too tired, too conservative.

Adron Doran, president, Morehead State College

College teachers today continue to teach those preparing to teach in elementary and secondary school in the same manner as they themselves were taught.

We need to know far more about how the disadvantaged children respond and learn, and then we need to modify the teacher education programs of preparation accordingly.

J. K. Haynes, executive secretary, Louisiana Education Association

Today, we are in a face-to-face confrontation with another important challenge in the desegregation process—that of desegregation of faculties. This will require a posture of leadership that this Nation cannot abdicate. A segregated faculty is discriminatory to all school children—thus, faculty desegregation becomes a vital component in desegregation of our public schools.

Harriet Reynolds, assistant director, Education and Youth Incentives, National Urban League

We must quickly develop new educational methods for reaching the so-called unmotivated student and his parents. Students will learn to the degree that education is made important to them, reasonable in terms of their value system, and rewarding. Parents will assist in motivation for education to the degree to which they are involved and understand both the process and the value which it holds for the child. These statements have been demonstrated, and what is now needed is a refinement of the techniques and a determination by the Office of Education of how we duplicate and expand successful projects without watering down the effect. May I suggest that the critical issue to be faced under Title I is how we develop new techniques rather than expand the old.

James G. Banks, executive director, United Planning Organization

The need for a sense of urgency among educators about this matter is so great that I would recommend that the Office of Education engage panels of evaluators for deployment throughout the country to study Title I programs. These panels should include parents of the disadvantaged, employers, social service people, poverty program officials as well as educators. One of the primary objectives of the panel should be to assist local school officials in recognizing the magnitude of the problem, their own role in its resolution, and the availability of a host of resources to assist in doing the job. Schools should be challenged to provide community leadership in meeting the need.

Margaret A. Dabney, professor of adult education, Virginia State College

This conference reiterated one of the first principles in programing: the need to involve the people for whom the programs are designed. However, even though all of this was enunciated time and time again I have some skepticism about the extent of its application; often when pressed, participants would admit that the people whom they were involving were really the friends of the poor who presumed to speak for the poor.

Jacob Silverberg, chief psychologist, Memorial Guidance Clinic

The key person who lives with the children everyday in the classroom is the teacher. Substantial enhancement of teacher training and of teacher acceptance and long-term work stability I see as very material provisions to cope with the problem of educating the disadvantaged child. Let us not find ourselves when the smoke settles with "disadvantaged teachers."

Marvin G. Cline, assistant director, Institute for Youth Studies, Howard University School of Medicine

A skillful teacher might be able to use a variety of helpers, but this requires a very careful analysis of the events in the classroom and the problems of management. Indiscriminate use of aides without preparation of the master teacher and the rest of the school structure may do more harm than good. Another danger in the use of aides comes from their restriction to custodial work in the classroom. While this may ease the teacher's burden, it also reinforces the child's view that poor people (if they are the source of aides) are typically the custodians, even in the school situation.

The notion of educational complexes or parks is an exciting and productive one. The large, flexible campus is the most attractive technique now available for reshaping the metropolitan school picture.

Frank L. Stanley, Jr., associate director for education, National Urban League

Excellence in public education in a democratic society must strive for academic, intellectual, and creative growth in terms of human values and human relations. Public education must have a purpose germane to the ideals of our society.

Therefore, academic skills should not be viewed as ends in themselves, but rather as tools for responsible, knowledgeable, and humane citizenship in a multiracial, pluralistic society.

Rodney Tillman, assistant superintendent in charge of elementary education, Minneapolis Public Schools

Teaching can no longer be considered as only working in the classroom with pupils. It must include time for planning appropriate learning opportunities for learners. This will require a longer year for many educators. It seems very inconsistent that education (formal schooling aspect), now generally agreed to be America's most important business, is carried on by part-time workers.

Robert L. Green, director of education, Southern Christian Leadership Conference

Significant progress will not be made in elevating the general staus of the poor until educators begin to adopt the *attitude* that our society must achieve a commitment to being fully open in (1) housing, (2) employment, (3) integrated education, and to the acceptance of all men without reservations. A federally financed program of inservice training for both teachers and administrators is immediately necessary.

The USOE should assume an aggressive leadership program both for schoolteachers and administrators, focusing on their responsibility in creating an atmosphere that will facilitate the type of democratic attitude that will lead to a fully open society. The components discussed above would also be relevant here.

Educators have long voiced their concern about building a democratic society; however in building this society, we must move outside of the narrow definition that has often been applied to the term "education."

A. Harry Passow, chairman, Committee on Urban Education, Teachers College, Columbia University

School systems have not dealt creatively with the technical aspects of evaluation of Title I programs—using the financial support as the means for diagnosis and differentiation as well as assessment and measurement. (In addition, we might use Title I evaluation as basis for a related cooperative research program to really study program effectiveness.) Far better assessment is needed.

Our approaches to parent education have been generally unimaginative. There is a "hidden curriculum" in the home of the achieving child. What elements of this can be or should be "taught" the parent of the disadvantaged child? Can we involve parents in the teaching process as a way of teaching them?

Don Davies, executive secretary, National Commission on Teacher Education and Professional Standards, National Education Association

Other suggestions, briefly noted, were—

- Set aside 10 percent of all Title I funds for small grants to individual teachers to enable them to carry out small projects and activities which they cannot or do not do because of lack of money. The grants might range from $500 to $2,000.
- Have no teacher in a disadvantaged school during his first 2 years of teaching carry more than a half-time load. Provide supervision, help, support for beginning teachers.
- Have institutes and workshops on the education of disadvantaged children in slum schools rather than on college campuses and hotels.
- Include in the elementary school curriculum for disadvantaged children the study of human behavior and human relations.
- Find a variety of ways to make the job of the teacher in the slum school more manageable and attractive—through teacher aides, help from other specialists, special preparation.
- Put all teachers in disadvantaged schools on a 12-month contract.

Dixon Bush, director, Antioch Interracial Education Program, Antioch College

There is disagreement as to what education is for the disadvantaged.

It can be cast as an urging to change and be like the dominant society. It could be an invitation to grow and become more extensive without rejecting antecedents. The first works only rarely, and then with questionable consequences; the second is a course which the schools are ill prepared to try. It will work, with effort.

John A. Morsell, associate director, National Association for the Advancement of Colored People

More work is needed to clarify our knowledge of the interaction between the child's state when entering school, what happens to him during his school years, and the nature of his nonschool environment.

For example: I have known that the gap in achievement of disadvantaged and advantaged children, substantial at first grade, widens over the next several years. It is assumed that this represents a challenge solely to the school, which is responsible for overcoming it. My personal inclination is to accept this view. But I and those who share this view would be on firmer ground if research could determine to what extent the widening of the gap represents school inadequacies and to what extent it represents the continuing and cumulative effect of the elements which produced the initial disparity.

In other words, how much can the schools accomplish, under the wisest and most resourceful programs, so long as the nonschool environment of disadvantaged children remains essentially the same?

The dictum that the segregated school is inherently inferior continues to stand, in some minds, as an inhibitor of efforts to make effective learning instruments out of schools which, for the foreseeable future, cannot possibly be desegregated. Some thorough clarification of what is possible, without in any sense sacrificing the ultimate goals of truly democratic education (i.e., integrated education), is greatly needed.

The junior high school contains all the problems of disadvantaged pupils in their most concentrated and virulent form. If we can hope for the end of the junior high school, there still remain the tens of thousands who will have to suffer through it until it is done away with. Attention paid to this area should also seek to determine whether, and to what extent, reorganization on a 4-4-4 basis actually eliminates junior high school problems or merely leaves them untouched under another name.

Leander J. Shaw, dean, Graduate School, Florida A. & M. University

This problem of the disadvantaged is serious enough to suggest that teacher training programs in colleges and universities become more specialized and directed toward training more teachers, counselors, and administrators for work with disadvantaged children. For its practical application, such a program should be interdisciplinary, which would permit the teachers who major in these specialized areas to integrate courses in many fields.

Irvamae Applegate, president, National Education Association

The use of the terms "innovation" and "imaginative thinking" should be played down and more emphasis given to meeting basic needs. Too many planners have interpreted innovation as being something completely new, and many man-hours have been wasted in seeking gimmicks which should have gone into a search for successful practices and how to adapt them to the local situation.

In the development of curriculum to meet the needs of educationally disadvantaged, it would be useful to planners if they could be helped to recognize that the principles of sound curriculum development apply and that they are really not dealing with anything so new or different, that they are now only being asked to face up to providing for a group not previously reached.

James L. Farmer, director, Center for Community Action Education

A teacher can be effective in teaching the disadvantaged only when he believes they can be taught, and believes in *them*—not in a romantic way, ascribing to *all* of them *all* of the virtues and *none* of the vices of man, but in the realistic sense that there is among them a reservoir of submerged intelligence, talent, and ability, the discovery of which is an exciting adventure, worthy of the best in any teacher. If the teacher views them as worthless, they sense it quickly, and this reinforces all that a hostile society has said to them in the past. In a word, the teacher must empathize.

There is a growing awareness among educators that many of the teacher's functions, especially nonteaching roles, can be performed by nonprofessionals working as teacher aides under the supervision of the teacher. Fuller, more creative use of the teacher aides not only frees the teacher to spend more time on teaching duties but also opens up new careers for nonprofessionals.

Instructional materials, including textbooks, need to be relevant to the lives, the experiences, and the frames of reference of the learners. Otherwise they cannot be meaningful aids to learning. Materials must deal with the things children know about—the kind of houses they live in, the kind of stores they shop in, the kind of streets they play in. Most importantly, the materials should deal with *themselves,* black faces as well as white. And they must learn about their people and their history, as they learn about other peoples and *their* histories.

Kay Earnhardt, coordinator of reading, Atlanta Public Schools

I am suggesting that the primary cause of learning disability might be directly attributable to the fact that the teacher is so unaware of the overall structure of her subject matter that she is unable to match the level of her presentation to the capacities of students of different abilities at different grades in school. I think there is sufficient evidence that much of what we already know to be sound educational practice is not taking place in many classrooms for the disadvantaged and that it might be a waste of time and energy to devise new programs when many of the ones we have now have never been used properly.

How can we design inservice training courses to help teachers meet the individual needs of their students? Are we going to continue to have facultywide inservice meetings where we all come together every other Tuesday afternoon to get enlightened, from kindergarten through grade 7? After 4 years of lectures at the college and university level I doubt that more of the same is going to bring about improved teaching. Inservice training needs to be as individualized as we want the classroom teaching to become. Teachers need today's questions answered today within the confines of their own classrooms, not Tuesday week in front of the entire faculty.

R. Lee Henney, director Adult and Literacy Education, Indianapolis Board of Fundamental Education

A subject which was cut very short beacuse of time was the evaluation of projects. We seem to have fallen in the trap in Title I projects of equating number of persons served with effectiveness of the program. It has been pointed out that in 10 months we served 7 million in Title I projects. However, what multiplier factor did we get in behavioral change? How different is the attitude of the participant? Does the teacher know how to use the new visual aids? Is the library being used by the target population? How do we measure change in the human being, especially from this population?

The question was raised, in our group, of why more money cannot be put into Title I projects for evaluation, and the question was not answered. This is a critical area where objectivity needs to be developed. All Title I projects should have moneys for evaluation, not only self-evaluation but outside evaluation by objective observers. Only can we increase our quality when we see the need for change.

The greatest contribution to Title I projects which can be developed is inservice training programs for the teacher. We put more specialized duties on the teachers and expect them to keep up without helping them find out how. Also, there seems to be little communication between staff in any given system or interchange of ideas between teachers at the local level. Title I projects should develop inservice training programs for all teachers and mandatory preservice and inservice training programs for Title I projects.

Roy McCanne, consultant, Education of Migrant Children, Colorado State Department of Education

It is a grave mistake to consider all disadvantaged children or even all migrant children as having the same culture. The cultural behavior patterns of one group, such as Mexican-Americans, are different in many respects from those of another group, such as Navajo Indians. Probably the most useful framework for studying cultural difference and for understanding how to adapt the school curriculum is the philosophical framework: What do the people believe is real? What do they think is true? Where do we get truth or knowledge? Where does man fit into the world? What is important, and what is not important? To whom or to what does a person owe his ultimate loyalty? Some research is available to help answer these questions about specific groups. More is needed.

Edmund W. Gordon, professor and chairman, Department of Educational Psychology and Guidance, Yeshiva University

The educational problems of the disadvantaged must be solved in the context of a concerted attack upon a wide variety of problems which go far beyond the school and involve aspects of society other than education. However, the tendency on the part of school people to focus on and blame these other problems for the school's problems and failures may serve to deter the school from a systematic attack upon those problems which are primarily within the realm of pedagogy and are primarily the responsibility of educators.

Robert E. Christin, director, Educational Projects Incorporated

I think the report should mention a major need related to all programs for the disadvantaged, that is, regional centers set up to bring together the better teachers from around the country to (1) develop teaching materials and approaches to help with the disadvantaged, and (2) demonstrate these discoveries at the centers and at schools in the region.

This seems to be a major problem in Title I, Upward Bound, the Job Corps, and in all schools serving the disadvantaged.

If we fail to help those many teachers of good will, we will fail, regardless of how much money we have or how many programs.

Leonard B. Ambos, assistant director, American Textbook Publishers Institute

It is obvious to me that a great deal more needs to be done to make Title I effective. There is a need for us to (1) determine those forces which create an individual's self-concept, (2) determine how we can upgrade the self-concept of individuals, (3) develop and test innovative methods and materials (and also the old which prove valuable) to determine their effectiveness in changing and improving learning behavior.

It may already be too late to salvage and make into productive citizens many of the children with whom we associate the term "disadvantaged." The times in which we live, however, insist that we aid each child to reach his maximum potential.

Educators must stop talking about "meeting the needs of individuals" and do something about it.

Evans Clinchy, director, Office of Program Development, Boston Public Schools

What bugs slum kids is *school*, school as it is conceived of and operated by the people who inhabited Panel IIIB. No one talked about how to change school itself or even how we could go about changing it or what we should change it into.

Most of the people in our room were simply taking Title I money and using it to add some sugar-coating to the same old bitter ineffectual pill. They were still planning to subject kids to the same basal readers (perhaps jazzed up with a few black faces). They were still going to expect kids to run the conventional rat race of right answers and coverage of large quantities of stale obsolete bodies of knowledge (or what one of the delegates referred to as the four R's of "rote, recall, regurgitation, and restraint").

One thing is becoming increasingly clear to me. The money poured into Title I is largely going to be wasted if we continue to spend it on bolstering the present system of educating children. Somehow we have to devise a way of putting at least that much money every year into research and the development of new and better ways of doing things.

Title I has to become much more directed toward breaking the established habits and patterns that have proved themselves totally incapable of even helping, much less educating, disadvantaged children. If this requires Congress to rewrite the title, so be it. But simply to assist the present system to do in a more elegant way what it is already doing so badly is to pervert the possibility of what American education should and could be.

Peter G. Kontos, professor of education, Princeton University

The major gaps in practices that were identified are: A lack of psychological and sociological theoretical frameworks from which an interactive effect of programs can be demonstrated; an absence of data as to the effect of an educational policy of programming early intervention; no real understanding of language development; a lack in definitive programs in teacher preparation; and, finally, an absence of adequate evaluation techniques.

Basically, the disadvantaged child, like all children, learns best in a child-centered, inductive, educational situation which is also racially integrated.

Staff development and teacher training are keys to the successful educational process; guidelines should therefore not be so tightly drawn—as they are now—as to include staff training for ony *specific* Title I programs. Changing the basic attitudes of teachers and administrators toward educational innovation and toward acceptance of disadvantaged children as learners should be a program which may be separately funded under Title I and should not be required to be part of any specific action program.

There is a great danger that programs that closely approximate the familiar are too easily funded. Evidence is beginning to indicate that these programs are most susceptible to failure. Disadvantaged children must not be subjected to playing the remediation catch-up game in which educators institutionalize the child by laying out his life in nine daily 40-minute remedial periods. In the midst of an educational revolution we cannot afford to prolong the dull and advocate the pedestrian.

Charles Benson, associate professor of education, University of California, Berkeley

It seemed to be generally agreed that teaching talent is distributed unequally among the schools in large cities, with slum schools having a disproportionate number of less trained and provisionally certificated persons. One primary way to attack the problem is desegregation, but this cannot be a short-term answer, physically speaking, in the largest cities—or not a complete answer anyway. What would seem to be good is that the Office of Education encourage the National Education Association and the American Federation of Teachers to devise schemes, semivoluntary from the point of view of the teacher, to afford staffs in slum schools that are balanced with respect to age, sex, training, and experience. It was suggested that teachers must work in a school setting in which they can be successful. Presently, criteria of success are mainly related to the academic performance of the collegebound. It was hoped that it might be possible to broaden the definition of success to include helping the disadvantaged to achieve at a higher level, starting from where the disadvantaged are. The analogy made was the satisfaction many teachers appear to gain from helping the physically handicapped to make progress.

The suggestion was made in our panel that there be established in inner-city areas institutions called professional schools. These schools would be centers of inservice training and educational research. An analogy would be the teaching hospital. Hopefully, teachers would regard it as a professional opportunity to be associated with these schools. One task of such schools could be to develop materials appropriate for the instruction of the disadvantaged. This suggestion combines opportunity for relevant inservice training and the reallocation of high-grade teaching talent to the inner city. It might serve to restore the large cities to a position of educational leadership.

I would also like to suggest that Title I programs emphasize mathematics in the middle school years. For the disadvantaged, there are fewer cultural blocks to excelling in mathematics than there appear to be in reading and verbal activities generally. Employment opportunities for persons who manage to acquire mathematical competence are good and seem likely to remain so. However, many elementary teachers, I believe, are themselves not attracted to mathematics, and the standard materials do not do a great deal to help stimulate the mathematically gifted.

John Henry Martin, superintendent, Mount Vernon Public Schools

From the urban centers of the country the achievement test scores and IQ ratings show a progressive decline in the relative position of school children of the racial minorities as compared to the white children in the city or the Nation. Their early childhood environment sends ghetto children to school handicapped, according to test scores, by 1 year. The radically unbalanced ghetto school will increase the negative distance of these children from their white age peers by as much as 2 to 3 years. This is the single most widespread educational catastrophe of our times. It is the root cause of the academic deficiencies of the disadvantaged child with which the schools of the Nation must deal. Failure to see Title I moneys as an opportunity and a commitment to do something about this while only seeing them as the source for remediating the consequences is to persist in treating the victims of malaria while continuing to ignore the breeding areas of mosquitoes.

Edward Zigler, professor of psychology, Yale University

A major issue in our discussions was whether the educators of the deprived should take a social work approach or should expand their energies and resources in beefing up those practices that are basic to the orthodox educational effort.

In my opinion, the dichotomy raised is a false one and stems from a failure to understand all the factors that are important in the determination of children's learning. Until teachers and administrators become fully cognizant of the complex nature of the learning process in the culturally deprived child, many of the innovations that hold high promise will be met with apathy, if not actual hostility.

The social work approach is not alien to successful teaching. What this approach does for the teacher is to make her sensitive to the socioeconomic plight, everyday experiences, and resulting motivational structure of the child she is to teach. This motivational structure accompanies every child to the classroom and is probably just as important in determining the success of the teacher's efforts as are the formal cognitive characteristics of the child.

APPENDIXES

APPENDIX A

PROGRAM OUTLINE

Monday, July 18	
2:00 p.m.	Registration.
5:30 p.m.	"Meet the Conferees," Chinese Room.
6:30 p.m.	OPENING GENERAL SESSON—Dinner in the Ballroom. Presiding: Hon. John W. Gardner, Secretary, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Statement: Ralph W. Tyler, National Advisory Council on the Education of Disadvantaged Children. Address: Vice President of the United States.
9:30 p.m.	Chairmen, Panelists, Consultants, and Summary Writers—New York Suite.
Tuesday, July 19	
9:00–12 noon	First Work Session (Panels).
2:00–4:00 p.m.	Second Work Session (Panels).
4:30–5:30 p.m.	Special Programs.
6:30 p.m.	SECOND GENERAL SESSION—Dinner in the Ballroom. Presiding: Arthur L. Harris, Associate Commissioner for Elementary and Secondary Education, U.S. Office of Education. Address: Harold Howe II, U.S. Commissioner of Education. Remarks: The President of the United States.
8:30–10:30 p.m.	Third Work Session. Panel Discussion: Techniques for Successful Follow-Through in State Conferences.
Wednesday, July 20	
7:30 a.m.	Chairmen, Panelists, Consultants, and Summary Writers, Breakfast, North Room.
9:00–12 noon	Fourth Work Session (Panels).
2:00–4:00 p.m.	FINAL GENERAL SESSION—State Room. Presiding: Commissioner Howe. Reports of Work Group Chairmen.

APPENDIX B

DISCUSSION PANELS

TOPIC I. DIAGNOSIS OF THE PROBLEM

Panel A

Chairman: Wilson C. Riles, director of compensatory education, State Department of Education, Sacramento, Calif.

Panelists

Harry L. Bowers, assistant superintendent, Preston County Schools, Kingwood, W. Va.

Charles Cogen, president, American Federation of Teachers, Chicago, Ill.

Roy McCanne, consultant, Education of Migrant Children, State Department of Education, Denver, Colo.

Philip Montez, State president, Association of Mexican-American Education, Los Angeles, Calif.

Arthur Pearl, professor of education, University of Oregon, Eugene, Oreg.

Leander J. Shaw, dean, Graduate School, Florida A & M University, Tallahassee, Fla.

Rodney Tillman, assistant superintendent in charge of elementary education, Minneapolis Public Schools, Minneapolis, Minn.

Consultants

William F. Brazziel, Office of Education

Stan J. Salett, Office of Economic Opportunity

Summary writer

James I. Morisseau, editorial associate, Educational Facilities Laboratories, New York, N.Y.

Panel B

Chairman: Donald T. Donley, director, Center for Research and Field Services, State University of Albany, Albany, N.Y.

Panelists

Msgr. Arthur T. Geoghegan, superintendent of schools, Diocese, of Providence, Providence, R.I.

Edmund W. Gordon, professor of educational psychology and guidance, Yeshiva University, New York, N.Y.

Philip M. Hauser, professor of sociology, University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill.

Mrs. Harriet Reynolds, assistant director, Education and Youth Incentives, National Urban League, New York, N.Y.

Jacob Silverberg, chief psychologist, Memorial Guidance Clinic, Richmond, Va.

Frank L. Stanley, Jr., associate director for education, National Urban League, New York, N.Y.

Consultants

Lee G. Burchinal, Office of Education

Martin W. Spickler, Office of Education

David S. Seeley, Office of Education

Summary writer

Barbara Carter, Free Lance Associates, Inc., New York, N.Y.

TOPIC II. STRATEGIES FOR ACTION

Panel A

Chairman: Thomas W. Pyles, director, Division of Federal-State Programs, State Department of Education, Baltimore, Md.

Panelists

Mrs. Irvamae Applegate, dean of education, St. Cloud State College, St. Cloud, Minn., *and* president, National Education Association

Paul I. Clifford, professor of education, Atlanta University, Atlanta, Ga.

Marvin G. Cline, assistant director, Institute for Youth Studies, School of Medicine, Howard University, Washington, D.C.

Don Davies, executive secretary, National Committee on Teacher Education and Professional Standards, National Education Associates, Washington, D.C.

R. Lee Henney, director, Adult and Literacy Education, Board for Fundamental Education, Indianapolis, Ind.

John A. Morsell, associate director, National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, New York, N.Y.

Consultants

Barbara H. Kemp, Office of Education

James E. Mauch, Office of Education

James K. Rocks, Office of Education

Summary writer

John Saunders, program specialist, Program Evaluation Branch, Office of Education

Panel B

Chairman: Austin Haddock, director of Title I, ESEA, State Department of Education, Salem, Oreg.

Panelists

Charles Benson, associate professor of education, University of California, Berkeley, Calif.

Max Birnbaum, director, Human Relations Laboratory, Boston University, Boston, Mass.

Larry Cuban, director, Cardozo Project in Urban Teaching, Cardozo High School, Washington, D.C.

James L. Farmer, president, Center for Community Action Education, Washington, D.C.

David Selden, assistant to the president, American Federation of Teachers, Chicago, Ill.

Edward Zigler, professor of psychology, Yale University, New Haven, Conn.

Consultants

John T. Cicco, Office of Education

Genevieve O. Dane, Office of Education

Carl L. Marburger, Bureau of Indian Affairs

Summary writer

G. K. Hodenfield, special projects writer, Indiana University, Bloomington, Ind.

TOPIC III. SOME EFFECTIVE APPROACHES

Panel A

Chairman: Mildred Fitzpatrick, chairman, Title I, ESEA, State Department of Education, Santa Fe, N. Mex.

Panelists

Donald Cleland, professor of education, University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, Pa.

Mrs. Kay Earnhardt, coordinator of reading, Atlanta Public Schools, Atlanta, Ga.

Edward B. Fort, director, Division of Instruction, Detroit Public Schools, Detroit, Mich.

Peter K. Kontos, professor of education, Princeton University, Princeton, N.J.

John Henry Martin, superintendent, Mount Vernon Public Schools, Mount Vernon, N.Y.

A. Harry Passow, chairman, Committee on Urban Education, Teachers College, Columbia University, New York, N.Y.

Consultants

John T. Blue, Office of Education

Nolan Estes, Office of Education

James E. Steffensen, Office of Education

Summary writer

Gloria Dapper, Free Lance Associates, Inc., New York, N.Y.

Panel B

Chairman: P. J. Newell, Jr., assistant commissioner, Division of Instruction, State Department of Education, Jefferson City, Mo.

Panelists

Mrs. Lorraine F. Bivins, supervisor, Cleveland Elementary School, Washington, D.C.

Dixon Bush, director, Antioch Interracial Education Program, Antioch College, Yellow Springs, Ohio

Evans Clinchy, director, Office of Program Development, Boston Public Schools, Boston, Mass.

Hyman H. Frankel, Special Project on Human Development, Southern Illinois University, Carbondale, Ill.

Robert L. Green, director of education, Southern Christian Leadership Conference, Atlanta, Ga.

Marvin Rich, executive director, Scholarship, Education, and Defense Fund for Racial Equality, New York, N.Y.

Consultants

Anita F. Allen, Office of Education

Kathryn Bloom, Office of Education

Summary writer

Peter Schrag, associate editor, *Saturday Review* Education Supplement, Amherst, Mass.

Chairman: John L. Cleveland, coordinator, Berkeley Unified School District, Berkeley, Calif.

TOPIC IV. MOBILIZING OUR RESOURCES

Panel A

Panelists

Leonard B. Ambos, assistant director, American Textbook Publishers Institute, New York, N.Y.

James G. Banks, executive director, United Planning Organization, Washington, D.C.

Mrs. Margaret G. Dabney, professor of adult education, Virginia State College, Petersburg, Va.

Mario D. Fantini, program associate, Ford Foundation, New York, N.Y.

John J. O'Neill, dean, Graduate School of Education, Rutgers, The State University, New Brunswick, N.J.

Donald P. Stone, assistant for education, Student Non-Violent Coordinating Committee, Atlanta, Ga.

Consultants

F. Peter Libassi, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare

Jule Sugarman, Office of Economic Opportunity

Grant Venn, Office of Education

Summary writer

Patricia Platt, editorial associate, National Schools Public Relations Association, Washington, D.C.

Panel B

Chairman: Irving Ratchick, coordinator, Title I, ESEA, State Education Department, Albany, N.Y.

Panelists

Norman Brombacher, assistant superintendent, New York City Public Schools, New York, N.Y.

Robert Christin, director, Educational Projects, Inc., Washington, D.C.

Adron Doran, president, Morehead State College, Morehead, Ky.

J. K. Haynes, executive secretary, Louisiana Education Association, Baton Rouge, La.

Mrs. Cernoria D. Johnson, director, Washington Office, National Urban League, Washington, D.C.

James Wilson, director, Indian Branch, Office of Economic Opportunity, Washington, D.C.

Consultants

Regina Goff, Office of Education

Samuel Halperin, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare

William J. Holloway, Office of Education

Louis J. McGuinness, Office of Education

Summary writer

Buckman Osborn, editorial consultant, Omnimedia International, Washington, D.C.

Superintendent of Documents Catalog No: FS 5.237:37004
U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
WASHINGTON : 1966

For sale by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office
Washington, D.C. 20204 - Price 55 cents

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE: 1966 O—232-844